By What Authority?

The Unfinished Reformation

A Short Companion to the By What Authority? Series

The Reformation is history's largest-scale real attempt to answer "by what authority?" by simply walking away from Rome's authority. This paper asks what the reformers actually did when they got the chance, and what they left standing.

This is a short companion piece to the By What Authority? series. It presumes the series' textual and institutional argument rather than restating it; readers new to the project should begin with Volume 1.

By What Authority? — The Unfinished Reformation (Companion Paper)
First public edition, July 2026.
This edition is complete as published; no ongoing update schedule is planned.

© Chrestos, 2026

Released under the Creative Commons
Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International licence (CC BY-SA 4.0).
Free to share, translate, adapt, and redistribute, including commercially,
provided attribution is given, changes are indicated, and adaptations are shared alike.
Full terms: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/

Canonical edition notice: this is the Chrestos edition.
Adaptations are permitted, but modified versions must identify their changes
and must not be presented as the Chrestos edition or the author's reconstruction
unless released by Chrestos.

Cite as: By What Authority project, Chrestos (2026), "The Unfinished Reformation" (companion paper).
DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.21446467`
Internet Archive: `archive.org/details/by-what-authority-the-unfinished-reformation`

This paper is a short companion to the By What Authority? series, not one of its three numbered volumes.
Series DOI: `10.5281/zenodo.20085840`
Series on Internet Archive: `archive.org/details/by-what-authority-full-series`

No institution. No publisher. Freely shared.

IN THIS SERIES

Volume 1 — The Argument in Brief
The complete case in one sitting. All the core claims; the evidence condensed.

Volume 2 — How Paul's Letters Were Edited
The full forty-nine-chapter argument: textual evidence, patristic timeline, gospel analysis, and the strongest objections answered.

Volume 3 — The Chain from Scripture to Sovereignty
The institutional and legal consequence: from the editorial programme to the Doctrine of Discovery, the oath architecture, and the question the system cannot answer.

Companion A — The Verse-by-Verse Analysis
The complete adjudication record: signal codes, confidence scores, and manuscript evidence for every assessed passage. Designed for scholarly consultation.

Companion B — The Reconstructed Pauline Letters
The ten Pauline letters with the identified interpolations removed. A clean reading text. Use alongside Companion A for the evidence behind each excision.

Companion C — The Apostolikon Antitheses
Marcion's lost Antitheses reconstructed from the interpolation-stripped Pauline corpus. Each entry places an Old Testament passage alongside its Apostolikon counterpart.

Full series: `archive.org/details/by-what-authority-full-series`

All volumes freely shared.
Verse-by-verse analysis dataset and workbench: `archive.org/details/by-what-authority-pauline-analysis-zip`

SHORT READINGS

Standalone introductory documents — each addresses the argument from a specific starting point.

The Argument in Twenty Minutes — a self-contained introduction: the full case from the felt tension to the Doctrine of Discovery, no prior reading required
archive.org/details/by-what-authority-argument-twenty-minutes
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465037

For People Drawn to Christianity — those who sense something real but cannot accept parts of what the tradition became
archive.org/details/by-what-authority-for-people-drawn-to-christianity
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465039

For People Who Left the Church — those who walked away and wonder whether they left the right thing
archive.org/details/by-what-authority-for-people-who-left-the-church
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465043

For Lawyers — those who work with authority and want to know where it comes from
archive.org/details/by-what-authority-for-lawyers
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465046

For Those Concerned with Indigenous Sovereignty — those who want to understand the documentary root of the colonial claim
archive.org/details/by-what-authority-indigenous-sovereignty
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465050

For People Who Have No Religion — those who assume Paul has nothing to say to them
archive.org/details/by-what-authority-for-secular-readers
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465052

For Military Personnel and Oath-Takers — those who have sworn allegiance and want to know what they swore to
archive.org/details/by-what-authority-for-military-oath-takers
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465055

The Unfinished Reformation — a short companion to the series: what the Reformation recovered from Marcion's instinct without knowing it, and what it left standing
archive.org/details/by-what-authority-the-unfinished-reformation
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21446467

Contents

BY WHAT AUTHORITY? 6

PART ONE: WHAT THE REFORMERS RECOVERED 9
Chapter 1: The Indulgence and the Instinct 10
Chapter 2: Two Kingdoms, One Text 14
Chapter 3: Marcion's Heir, Unknowingly 18

PART TWO: WHAT THE TEXT STILL DID TO THEM 22
Chapter 4: The Peasants Take Luther at His Word 23
Chapter 5: Calvin's Anabaptist Problem 27
Chapter 6: Münster and the Manufacture of a Bogeyman 32
Chapter 7: The Trinity Reopened — Servetus 36
Chapter 8: Tyndale and the Control of the Text 40
Chapter 9: The Long Tail — Quakers and the Affirmation 46

PART THREE: THE PATTERN AND ITS LIMITS 50
Chapter 10: The Spectrum — Censure, Banishment, and the Stake 51
Chapter 11: What the Pattern Predicts 56
Chapter 12: The Limits of the Pattern — Luther's Antisemitism 60
Chapter 13: The Strongest Objections 64
Chapter 14: The Franchise 68
Appendix A: Timeline, 1170s–1978 72
Appendix B: Primary Source Excerpts 77
B.1 — Luther, the Ninety-Five Theses (31 October 1517) 77
B.2 — Luther, Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed (1523) 77
B.3 — Luther, An Admonition to Peace (April 1525) 78
B.4 — Luther, Against the Murderous, Thieving Hordes of Peasants (May 1525) 78
B.5 — The Schleitheim Confession, Articles VI and VII (24 February 1527) 79
B.6 — The trial of Michael Sattler (Rottenburg, 1527) 79
B.7 — Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, Book IV, Chapter 20 (1559) 79
B.8 — The trial and sentencing of Michael Servetus (Geneva, 1553) 80
B.9 — Tyndale's reported last words (Vilvoorde, 6 October 1536) 80
B.10 — Thomas Cranmer's final address and execution (St Mary's, Oxford, 21 March 1556) 80
B.11 — The Quakers Act 1695 (royal assent 1696) 81
Appendix C: Limits, Contested Points, and Counter-Cases 82
C.1 — The comparison-set methodology and its own limits 82
C.2 — The multi-variable complexity trade-off 82
C.3 — Novelty calibration 83
C.4 — The antisemitism material's bounded status 83
C.5 — Sources sought but not obtained 83
C.6 — What this volume does not argue 84
Appendix D: Selected Bibliography 85
D.1 — Primary sources (public domain) 85
D.2 — Secondary scholarship 86
D.3 — Cross-references within the series 87
Appendix E: The Comparison Set, Full Table 88
Reading the table 89

BY WHAT AUTHORITY?

The Unfinished Reformation

A Companion Paper — Chrestos Investigation

How this paper relates to the series

This paper is a short companion to the By What Authority? series — narrower in scope than Volumes 1 through 3, and confined to a single historical episode rather than the full textual and institutional argument. Readers who want the series' core case should start with Volume 1. What follows here presumes that case rather than restating it.

Volume 1 set out the short case: that the New Testament we inherited is not the text the earliest reconstructable reader had in front of him, and that the shape of the difference is not random.

Volume 2 built the full argument from the manuscripts outward: how Paul's letters were edited, what was added and why, and what remains once the additions are set aside.

Volume 3 followed the edited text forward through history — into the canon, into the Doctrine of Discovery, into four continents of colonial dispossession, and into the architecture of oaths that still binds citizens, soldiers, and officials into chains of authority their conscience never separately examined. It ended by asking the question the whole series has been building toward: by what authority?

This paper answers a question Volume 3 leaves open. If the edited text is the load-bearing wall of an institution that has justified dispossession, executed dissenters, and bound consciences for a thousand years — what happened the one time in European history when large numbers of Christians tried to tear

that wall down? The Reformation is history's largest-scale real attempt to answer "by what authority?" by simply walking away from Rome's authority. This paper asks what the reformers actually did when they got the chance, and what they left standing.

Before you start: two claims this paper builds on

This paper does not re-argue the case made in the earlier volumes. It treats two of that case's findings as settled ground and moves from there. A reader coming to this paper without having read Volumes 1 through 3 should know what those two findings are, so that what follows can be weighed rather than simply taken on faith.

The first finding (Volumes 1–2): several New Testament passages this paper leans on — Romans 13:1–7 chief among them — are very likely later insertions into Paul's letters rather than Paul's own words. The case for this rests on manuscript evidence: these passages are absent from the reconstructable text of Paul's letters preserved in Marcion's mid-second-century Apostolikon, our earliest attested edition of the Pauline corpus, and they carry stylistic and argumentative signatures that break with the surrounding authentic material. On that evidence, Marcion's text is not a mutilated version of a fuller original — he cut nothing out of it — but an earlier state of the text, predating the additions. The full case is in Volume 2 (Chapters 1, 3, and 6, and Appendix A).

The second finding (Volume 3): the legal and political authority claimed by Western states and churches traces, through a documented chain of legal and doctrinal instruments, back to those same passages — through the Doctrine of Discovery, the canon-law inheritance, and the sworn-oath architecture that still binds officeholders today. Volume 3 argues that no institution in that chain has ever openly examined its own foundation, because the institutions positioned to examine it are themselves constituted by it. See Volume 3, Chapter 4 ("The Doctrine of Discovery") and Chapter 20 ("The Question the System Cannot Answer").

Neither finding is re-argued here. A reader who wants to test them should go to the source. A reader willing to grant both, provisionally, for the sake of what follows, can proceed straight to Chapter 1: the question this paper asks is what happened the one time large numbers of people, having arrived independently at something like the first finding, tried to act on the second.

The short answer is that they recovered something Marcion had already found fourteen centuries earlier — that grace overrides law, that a believer needs no priest between himself and the text — and then discovered they had inherited, unexamined, the very text Rome's centuries of controversialists had shaped to make that discovery survivable for an institution rather than dangerous to it. What follows is the story of what happened next: to the peasants who took Luther at his word, to the Anabaptists who refused a sworn oath on grounds Christ himself supplied, to a Spanish physician who reopened a fourth-century argument about God's nature, to a translator who wanted ordinary readers to have what the reformers said they should have, and to a Quaker minority who eventually got, after more than three centuries, what an Anabaptist minority never received at all.

None of the individual observations in this volume are new. Historians have described the Reformation's relationship to the modern state, the persecution of heresy as a function of institutional interest rather than doctrinal danger, and the mechanics of scapegoating, for decades. What this volume adds is a specific claim, tested rather than merely asserted: that institutional violence in this period tracked four identifiable control mechanisms — who mediates the text, who polices doctrinal boundaries, who administers the oath, who owns the social hierarchy — and that it did so in a graduated, measurable way, across cases that were suppressed and cases that were not. Chapter 10 lays out that test in full, with its own coded table, for any reader who wants to check the working rather than take the conclusion on faith. That is the same standard Volume 3 of this series asked of itself, and the same standard this paper asks of you.

PART ONE: WHAT THE REFORMERS RECOVERED

Chapter 1: The Indulgence and the Instinct

The Reformation begins with an argument about money, and the argument about money is, in this series' own vocabulary, a grace-principle objection to a transaction-principle mechanism. Before this book complicates that beginning, it is worth giving it its full due.

A church built on commission

In 1515, Pope Leo X proclaimed a plenary indulgence for the Archbishoprics of Magdeburg and Mainz. The stated purpose was to finish rebuilding St Peter's Basilica in Rome, a project that had been consuming money for a decade already. The actual purpose, undisclosed to the men who bought the indulgences, was partly different: a secret agreement routed a share of the proceeds to the Fugger banking house of Augsburg, in repayment of a debt owed by Albrecht of Brandenburg, the newly installed Archbishop of Mainz. Albrecht held three ecclesiastical sees at once, an arrangement that required a special dispensation from Rome, and the dispensation had not been cheap. He had borrowed from the Fuggers to pay for his own promotion. The indulgence campaign was, among other things, a debt-service instrument for a clergyman's purchase of his own office.

The campaign was run on commission. The Dominican friar Johann Tetzel, its most energetic salesman, worked German towns with a traveling operation that had the structure of a sales drive: a fixed price list by sin and by rank, a strongbox with three locks (so that no single official could access the proceeds alone), and a marketing promise that went further than the theology behind it strictly supported — that an indulgence could shorten or end the suffering of a

relative already dead and already in purgatory. A rhyme attributed to Tetzel's campaign, whether or not he coined it himself, captured the pitch precisely: as soon as the coin rings in the box, the soul springs from purgatory.

This is a transaction in the fullest and most literal sense available to the sixteenth century: an audited cash exchange, run through a commissioned network, for a benefit priced by category and denominated in specific coin. It is not a metaphor for a transactional theology. It is a transactional theology with a cash register attached.

Luther's ninety-five objections

On 31 October 1517, Martin Luther, an Augustinian friar and professor at the University of Wittenberg, posted (or, on the more cautious modern account, circulated by letter to his bishop and colleagues) ninety-five theses for academic disputation on the power and efficacy of indulgences. Several of them go directly at the transactional mechanism rather than at any point of doctrine about purgatory itself:

Thesis 45: "Christians are to be taught that he who sees a man in need, and passes him by, and gives his money for pardons, purchases not the indulgences of the pope, but the indignation of God."

Thesis 50: "Christians are to be taught that if the pope knew the exactions of the pardon-preachers, he would rather that St Peter's church should go to ashes, than that it should be built up with the skin, flesh, and bones of his sheep."

Thesis 82: "Why does not the pope empty purgatory, for the sake of holy love and of the dire need of the souls that are there, if he redeems an infinite number of souls for the sake of miserable money with which to build a Church?"

Thesis 86: "Why does not the pope, whose wealth is to-day greater than the riches of the richest, build just this one church of St Peter with his own money, rather than with the money of poor believers?"

Read together, these are not primarily a complaint about a false doctrine. They are a complaint about a transaction — about the direction money moves, about who profits, about a spiritual good being priced and sold to people who can least afford it. Luther's target is not "purgatory is unbiblical," though he will get there. His target, in October 1517, is: this exchange is a fraud on the poor, dressed as a sacrament.

What the series' own vocabulary makes visible

Volumes 1 and 2 of this series describe a pattern that runs through the editorial history of the New Testament itself: a repeated pull, across a century and a half of copying and recopying, toward reattaching grace to a transactional structure — a law that must be satisfied, a debt that must be paid, a sacrifice whose currency is a body rather than coin. Luther's opening objection to the indulgence system belongs, structurally, to the opposite instinct. It is a grace-principle objection: the idea that salvation is a gift and cannot be metered, priced, or sold, and that any system claiming to sell it has therefore mistaken its own nature. "The just shall live by faith," the verse Luther later said had opened the whole Reformation to him, is not a transactional sentence. It does not describe an exchange. It describes a status conferred rather than a price paid.

This is worth stating plainly and without irony, because the rest of this book is going to complicate it. Luther did not begin as an institutional creature defending an old transactional order against a plucky challenger. He began, on this one specific and well-documented occasion, on the other side of the very line this series has drawn since Volume 1: grace against transaction, gift against exchange, faith against ledger. Whatever else this book has to say about what Luther did in the following decade, it should say first that he started somewhere real.

The question this book is actually asking

The interesting question is not whether Luther's opening protest was sincere or well-founded. On the evidence, it plainly was both. The interesting question is what he was standing on when he made it — what text, inherited from what process, he took as simply given, without applying to it the same scrutiny he was about to apply to indulgences, purgatory, and eventually the papacy itself.

Because the text Luther appealed to over Rome's head — the text he would spend the rest of his life defending as sola scriptura, scripture alone, sufficient and self-interpreting — was not a neutral, uncontested document waiting to be liberated from clerical monopoly. It was, per the argument of Volumes 1 and 2 of this series, already the product of a century and a half of exactly

the kind of institutional editing Luther was in the process of discovering elsewhere in the Church: additions that reattached a grace-centered gospel to law, to hierarchy, to the legitimacy of civil punishment. Luther broke Rome's monopoly on interpreting the text. He never questioned whether the text itself was already Rome's product.

The next chapter follows that inheritance directly, into the single passage of scripture that will do more work in this book than any other: Romans 13, and the "Two Kingdoms" doctrine Luther builds on it two years before he needs it against an army of peasants who took his own theology seriously.

Chapter 2: Two Kingdoms, One Text

Sola scriptura turns out to mean sola the text a century and a half of proto-orthodox editing had already produced, and that Rome had spent the eleven centuries since defending as original. Luther inherited the Catholicised canon — additions and all — without ever subjecting it to the kind of scrutiny he applied to indulgences, purgatory, or papal authority.

The treatise, two years before it was needed

In 1523, four years before the Peasants' War made the question urgent, Luther published Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed. The treatise sets out to answer a question the Reformation itself had raised without quite meaning to: if the individual believer is justified by faith alone, answers directly to God, and needs no priestly institution standing between himself and grace, does he still need to obey a prince?

Luther's answer is unambiguous, and he grounds it in a single passage: "First, we must provide a sound basis for the civil law and sword so no one will doubt that it is in the world by God's will and ordinance. The passages which do this are the following: Romans 13: 'Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.'"

Volume 2 of this series argues, on independent stylometric, source-critical, and semantic-coherence grounds, that Romans 13:1–7 is very likely an interpolation into Paul's letter — a passage absent from the reconstructable text Marcion's mid-second-century Apostolikon preserves, added by a later, insti-

tutionally-minded editor to bind the Jesus movement's ethic of grace back onto the existing structure of civil obedience and legal order. Whether or not a reader accepts that argument in full, the historical fact relevant here does not depend on it: Luther received this passage without suspicion, without applying to it any of the textual and historical scrutiny he was at the very same moment applying to the doctrine of purgatory, to the sacramental system, and to papal primacy. Indulgences, an invention of the medieval church with a traceable history, drew his fiercest criticism. Romans 13, a passage whose own textual history is at minimum contested, drew none. He built the entire foundation of his political theology on it as though it had arrived from Paul's hand unmediated.

Two kingdoms, one law each

The doctrine Luther constructs from that foundation divides all humanity into two kingdoms. "Those who belong to the kingdom of God are all true believers who are in Christ and under Christ," he writes — and these people, in principle, need no law at all, because "Christians have in their heart the Holy Spirit, who both teaches and makes them to do injustice to no one, to love everyone, and to suffer injustice and even death willingly and cheerfully at the hands of anyone." This is a genuinely radical claim, and it sits close to the series' own account of grace: an inward transformation that makes external compulsion unnecessary, in principle, for the transformed.

But almost in the same breath, Luther supplies the qualifying clause that will do all the work later: "There are few true believers, and still fewer who live a Christian life… For this reason God has provided for them a different government beyond the Christian estate and kingdom of God. He has subjected them to the sword so that, even though they would like to, they are unable to practice their wickedness… In the same way a savage wild beast is bound with chains and ropes so that it cannot bite and tear as it would normally do."

The "savage wild beast" is not a rhetorical flourish that disappears once the argument moves on. It is the operative image. Nearly everyone, on Luther's own reckoning, belongs to this second kingdom — bound, chained, and restrained not because they have done wrong but because the mass of humanity cannot be trusted with the freedom the Gospel in principle offers. The chapter that follows this one will show what happens when a specific mass of humanity — German peasants, reading Luther's own pamphlets —

concludes that the Gospel's freedom does, in fact, apply to them, and acts on that conclusion in the material world rather than confining it to an inward, spiritual register. Luther has already supplied, in 1523, the exact vocabulary he will need in 1525 to explain why that conclusion was a category error requiring the sword.

The carve-out that becomes the containment

The treatise's second load-bearing clause concerns the limits of temporal power: "The temporal government has laws which extend no further than to life and property and external affairs on earth, for God cannot and will not permit anyone but himself to rule over the soul. Therefore, where the temporal authority presumes to prescribe laws for the soul, it encroaches upon God's government and only misleads souls and destroys them."

This looks, on its face, like a limitation on the prince's power — a carve-out protecting the individual conscience from state interference in belief. And in one sense it is: it is the clause that will eventually, centuries later, underwrite arguments for freedom of conscience and the separation of church and state. But notice what it does not protect. It protects the soul's belief. It says nothing about the body's obedience, the household's hierarchy, or the distribution of property and rents — all of which remain squarely inside "life and property and external affairs on earth," which is to say squarely inside the sword's jurisdiction. Grace, on this architecture, is free to transform the inward man. It has no standing to touch the outward arrangement of society at all. The moment a theological conviction produces a social or economic claim — as it will, catastrophically for the peasants, in 1525 — it has, by Luther's own 1523 definition, left the kingdom where grace operates and entered the kingdom where the sword does.

What was never re-examined

Set this against Luther's treatment of indulgences one more time. He asked, forensically, where the money went, who profited, what the historical origin of the practice was, and whether it had any basis in the text he took as authoritative. He never asked the same set of questions about Romans 13 itself — not because the passage was self-evidently beyond question, but because sola scriptura as Luther practiced it took "scripture" as a fixed, given

quantity rather than as a manuscript tradition with its own contested history of expansion. The canon that had spent roughly a century and a half, on this series' account, absorbing law-affirming, hierarchy-affirming, oath-affirming material to reattach an originally grace-centered movement to institutional authority, passed into Luther's hands whole. He broke Rome's monopoly on telling him what the text meant. He never broke, or even noticed, Rome's much earlier and much more consequential hand in deciding what the text was.

The next chapter draws the parallel this whole book has been building toward directly: the same grace-over-law, direct-access-over-mediation instinct that drove Luther in 1517 had already been drawn, from substantially the same body of material, by a figure the institutional Church spent seventeen centuries treating as its founding heretic.

Chapter 3: Marcion's Heir, Unknowingly

Luther's "grace alone" and "priesthood of all believers" are structurally the same intuition Marcion drew from the same corpus fourteen centuries earlier — minus Marcion's willingness to name the God of law and the God of grace as different powers, and minus any awareness that the text he was working from was itself the product of the very redactional programme this series has traced since Volume 1.

Two men, one instinct, fourteen centuries apart

Marcion of Sinope, expelled from the church at Rome around the year 144, believed that Paul's true gospel had been overwritten by editors intent on reattaching it to the Creator-God of the Jewish law. He compiled a canon of his own — a single gospel and ten letters of Paul — and organized congregations around a stark opposition: grace against law, the God who saves against the God who judges, direct standing before Christ against the mediating claims of an institution that increasingly resembled the very legal order the gospel had, in Marcion's reading, come to abolish.

Martin Luther, condemned by Rome in 1521, believed that Paul's true gospel had been overwritten by a papal-sacramental system intent on selling what could only be given. He did not compile a new canon — he kept the received one entirely intact — but he organized his entire theological revolution around the same stark opposition Marcion had used: grace against law, the God who justifies the sinner freely against a religious economy of merit and payment, direct standing before Christ ("the priesthood of all believers")

against the mediating claims of a clerical hierarchy that had, by 1517, mastered the art of pricing salvation by the coin.

Neither man invented this opposition. Both found it already present, waiting to be drawn out, in the same body of Pauline material — because, on this series' argument, that opposition really was there from the start, in the letters as they were written, and it is what the intervening editorial programme was built to blunt. Marcion's copies of Paul's letters preserve, on this series' account, an earlier state of the text — one that had not yet absorbed the apparatus of covenant, hierarchy, and inherited legal obligation that later proto-orthodox editors would graft onto it. He did not cut that apparatus out; there was nothing to cut, because it had not yet been added to the letters he held. His canon simply reproduced the stark opposition — grace against law — that the earlier text already contained undiluted, and he organized his congregations around exactly that. Luther drew the same opposition from a very different copy: a text that had spent an additional fourteen centuries accumulating the very material Marcion's letters never carried. He drew a fainter version of Marcion's line and then, without quite noticing, let most of the apparatus back in through a side door: retained the Old Testament as scripture, retained Romans 13 as binding civil doctrine, retained the household codes, retained a doctrine of penal substitution that requires law to be satisfied rather than simply set aside. The question this later material poses — is this really part of the gospel, or is it a later addition dressed as one? — was never a question Marcion's text needed to raise, because his text did not contain the material in question. It was a question Luther's text raised on nearly every page where grace and law visibly pulled against each other, and Luther never asked it of the text itself — only of Rome's interpretation of a text he never doubted was simply, uniformly, "scripture."

What Luther could not have known

This is not a failure of nerve on Luther's part, and it would be unfair to read it as one. Luther had no access to Marcion's actual writings — nothing of the Antitheses survives, and what little the sixteenth century knew of Marcion came filtered entirely through Tertullian's five hostile books against him, composed around the year 207 with the explicit purpose of proving Marcion a mutilator of an already-complete text. Luther inherited, along with the rest of Western Christendom, thirteen centuries of a settled historical verdict:

Marcion cut the Bible down to suit his heresy. There was no live scholarly tradition in 1517 proposing the alternative this series' first two volumes argue for — that Marcion's shorter text may in fact represent an earlier state of the Pauline corpus, and that the material absent from it was added, not removed. Luther could not have drawn the connection this chapter draws, because the evidence that would let him draw it did not exist as an available hypothesis in his lifetime, and would not become one in any serious, textually-grounded form until the last few decades.

What Luther could have done, and did not, was apply his own stated method — return to the earliest available text, strip away what later tradition had added, trust the plain sense of the letter over the interpretive apparatus built on top of it — to the letter itself, rather than only to its Roman interpretation. He performed this operation on the doctrine of indulgences, on the sacramental system, on monastic vows, on the papacy. He never performed it on the text he was defending against Rome, because in his framework the text was simply "scripture," a fixed and settled quantity, and the only live question was who got to interpret it. The question of whether the text he held had itself already been shaped by exactly the kind of institutional interest he was busy denouncing elsewhere never opened, because sola scriptura is, definitionally, a doctrine about interpretive authority, not a doctrine about textual history.

The instinct survives; the text does not change

This is the thesis the rest of this book will test against the historical record, case by case. The Reformation recovered Marcion's instinct — that grace overrides law, that the believer stands before God without an institutional intermediary — and applied it with real courage against the specific institutional abuses of early sixteenth-century Catholicism. It never subjected the received canon to the same interrogation, because doing so was never within the frame of the question the reformers were asking. The canon that had spent a century and a half, on this series' account, absorbing law-affirming, hierarchy-affirming, oath-affirming material passed into Protestant hands whole: Romans 13 and all, the household codes and all, the doctrine of a wrathful Creator requiring satisfaction and all.

What changes, then, is not the text. What changes is who is authorized to enforce what it says. The remainder of this book follows that authority as it moves — from Rome to Wittenberg, to Geneva, to Zurich, to London —

and asks, at each stop, what happened to the people who took the recovered instinct further than the new authorities were prepared to let it go. It begins with the people who had the least reason to expect any mercy from either side, and got none: the peasants who read Luther's own pamphlets and drew the conclusion he had not intended them to draw.

PART TWO: WHAT THE TEXT STILL DID TO THEM

Chapter 4: The Peasants Take Luther at His Word

The peasants were not killed for heresy or doctrinal error — Luther himself concedes their grievances were often just. They were killed for drawing the social and economic inference that grace theology dissolves hierarchy — the exact inference the institutional reading of Romans 13 exists to foreclose.

Twelve articles, most of them Luther agrees with

In the winter of 1524–25, peasant communities across Swabia and the surrounding territories drew up a list of grievances known as the Twelve Articles, and did something that marks the document as a genuine child of the Reformation rather than of an older tradition of peasant revolt: they supported each demand with a citation of scripture, and offered, in the twelfth article, to withdraw any article that could be shown "really to be against the word of God by a clear explanation of the Scripture." (Luther, in his own reply, paraphrases this same offer as a willingness to be corrected "by clear, plain, undeniable passages of Scripture" — a phrase that is his gloss on the article, not the peasants' own wording.) The articles asked for the right of a community to choose and depose its own pastor; for tithes to remain locally, funding that pastor and the poor rather than flowing upward to distant institutions; for the abolition of serfdom, on the express ground that "Christ has delivered and redeemed us all… it is consistent with Scripture that we should be free"; and for a reduction of the rents, services, and death-duties that had been steadily increased over the preceding decades.

Luther's first response, An Admonition to Peace, written in April 1525, is more sympathetic to this document than most modern readers expect. He

tells the princes bluntly that they, not the peasants, bear the primary responsibility: "in your temporal government, you do nothing but flay and rob your subjects… The sword is at your throats, but you think yourselves so firm in the saddle that no one can unhorse you." He calls the peasants' request for the gospel and their own chosen pastors impossible to reject "with any show of right." He goes further: "The other articles recite physical grievances, such as Leibfall, imposts and the like; and they, too, are fair and just… Flaying and extortion are, in the long run, intolerable."

This concession matters more than it is usually given credit for. Luther is not disputing the facts of the peasants' oppression. He is not arguing that their reading of scripture on these points is mistaken. On the substance of their case, he largely agrees with them.

Where he draws the line, and why

Having conceded the grievances, Luther then does something that will determine the shape of the rest of this chapter, and much of the rest of this book: he tells the peasants that none of it entitles them to act. "The fact that the rulers are wicked and unjust does not excuse tumult and rebellion, for to punish wickedness does not belong to everybody, but to the worldly rulers who bear the sword." He grounds this directly in the passage Chapter 2 already showed him building into a full political theology two years earlier: "How can you get over these sayings and laws of God, when you boast that you are acting according to divine law, and yet take the sword in your own hands, and revolt against the 'higher powers' that are ordained of God? Do you not think that Paul's judgment in Romans 13:2 will strike you?"

Notice the structure of the argument. The grievance is real. The peasants' Third Article grounds the case for abolishing serfdom directly in Christ's redemption of all people, without citing a specific verse by number — and Luther's rebuttal, tellingly, has to reach for a text of its own to contain that claim: "This article would make all men equal, and turn the spiritual kingdom of Christ into a worldly, external kingdom; and that is impossible. For a worldly kingdom cannot stand unless there is in it an inequality of persons… St. Paul says in Galatians 3:28, that in Christ master and servant are one thing" — the very verse this series' own Volume 2 reads as dissolving social rank, redeployed by Luther to mean the opposite: an inward equality with no outward consequence at all. The believer's freedom, Luther insists, is real, but

it is confined to an inward register — it does not authorize any change to the outward, worldly order of masters and servants, however genuinely Christ's teaching might seem to imply one. This is precisely the "spiritual carve-out" from Chapter 2, now doing its real work: grace transforms the soul; it has no jurisdiction over the distribution of land, rent, or status.

The escalation

The peasants did not stand down. Encouraged in some regions by more radical preachers — Thomas Müntzer prominent among them, whom Luther names directly as "the arch-devil himself" reigning at Mühlhausen — armed bands of peasants continued to seize monasteries, burn castles, and, in some documented instances, kill members of the nobility. Luther's second pamphlet, written within weeks of the first and titled without ambiguity Against the Murderous, Thieving Hordes of Peasants, abandons the earlier tract's balance entirely.

He opens by cataloguing three sins the peasants have committed, and the first is not violence at all — it is the breaking of an oath: "First they have sworn to their true and gracious rulers to be submissive and obedient… But since they have deliberately and sacrilegiously abandoned their obedience… they have thereby forfeited body and soul, as perfidious, perjured, lying, disobedient wretches." Only the second listed sin concerns the actual robbery and killing the peasant bands had carried out. The oath-breaking is named first, and it is named using precisely the Romans 13 doctrine the Admonition had already established a month earlier — the same text, now doing lethal rather than merely restraining work.

What follows is among the starkest sentences Luther ever wrote: "Have mercy on these poor people! Stab, smite, slay, whoever can. If you die in doing it, well for you! A more blessed death can never be yours, for you die in obeying the divine Word and commandment in Romans 13, and in loving service of your neighbor, whom you are rescuing from the bonds of hell and of the devil." He compares the peasants to a mad dog that must be killed on sight, and to a fire that must be extinguished by whoever reaches it first: "It is right and lawful to slay at the first opportunity a rebellious person… Every man is at once judge and executioner of a public rebel."

The German Peasants' War of 1524–25 is conventionally estimated, across general historiography, to have killed approximately 100,000 peasants — a

round figure that predates and is independent of any single scholar's count, though Peter Blickle's The Revolution of 1525 remains the standard English-language interpretive account of the war itself. The great majority of the dead fell in the suppression that followed Luther's second tract, at the hands of princely armies that Luther's own pamphlet had explicitly absolved in advance of any guilt for whatever violence they used.

What the sequence actually demonstrates

Read the two tracts together and a pattern emerges that the rest of this book will trace again and again in different settings. The peasants were not killed because their theology was wrong — Luther concedes the substance of their grievances in the very document that precedes the massacre. They were not killed for heresy in any doctrinal sense; nothing in the Twelve Articles touches the Trinity, the sacraments, or any question the councils of the church had ever formally settled. They were killed because they drew, from Luther's own "grace alone" gospel, a social and economic inference — that the freedom Christ gives dissolves the legitimacy of serfdom and unjust rent — that the institutional reading of Romans 13 exists precisely to prevent anyone from drawing. Luther's own theology supplied both halves of the encounter: the grace that inspired the peasants to imagine a freer arrangement, and the law that then, in his hands, authorized their extermination for imagining it.

This is the first clear instance of what this book calls the hierarchy mechanism: violence directed not at a doctrine but at a social and economic entailment drawn from a doctrine everyone agrees is true. It will not be the last mechanism this book documents, and the peasants will not be the last people found guilty of taking a reformer's own words further than the reformer was willing to let them go. The next chapter turns to a different mechanism entirely — not what happens when grace theology touches the hierarchy of land and rent, but what happens when a rival Christian movement builds an entire alternative community around refusing the single ritual, the civil oath, that binds an individual into any chain of authority at all.

Chapter 5: Calvin's Anabaptist Problem

The magisterial Reformation's foundational civil-government theology was built in real time against the Radical Reformation's oath and sword refusal — not as abstract doctrine, but as a live argument with a named opponent.

Seven articles, drawn from the same well as Luther's

On 24 February 1527 — less than two years after the peasants Chapter 4 describes were cut down invoking Luther's own theology against them — a small conference of Swiss Brethren meeting at Schleitheim, in the canton of Schaffhausen, adopted a confession of seven articles: baptism, the ban, breaking of bread, separation from the world, pastors, the sword, and the oath. The document is, in its own way, as radical an application of "grace over law, direct access over mediation" as anything this book will describe, and it draws on exactly the same reservoir of Pauline and Gospel material the whole Reformation was working from.

Article VI addresses the sword directly, and grounds its refusal in the plainest possible reading of the Sermon on the Mount: "it is not appropriate for a Christian to serve as a magistrate," the confession states, "because… the government magistracy is according to the flesh, but the Christian's is according to the Spirit… the weapons of their conflict and war are carnal… but the Christian's weapons are spiritual." Article VII goes further and refuses the oath itself, on grounds that read as a direct, unembellished application of Matthew 5:34–37: "Christ, who teaches the perfection of the Law, prohibits all swearing to His followers, whether true or false… we cannot fulfill that which

we promise when we swear, for we cannot change even the very least thing on us." The Schleitheim brethren anticipate, and answer point by point, the two objections everyone in the sixteenth century would immediately raise — that God himself swore an oath to Abraham, and that Peter and Paul swore oaths in the New Testament — with an argument that distinguishes testifying about the present from promising the future, and concludes, simply: "we shall not swear at all."

The chapter Calvin wrote against them

Twenty-six years pass between Schleitheim and the final Latin edition of John Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion (1559), but the confrontation this chapter describes is present from the Institutes' very first treatment of civil government, and it never lets up. Book IV, Chapter 20, "Of Civil Government," is Calvin's single most authoritative statement of Reformed political theology — the foundational document, in effect, of magisterial Protestant statecraft — and its own chapter summary announces, without any softening, that several of its sections are written "in opposition to the frantic proceedings of the Anabaptists."

Calvin states their position before refuting it, and states it fairly: "Fanatics, indeed, delighting in unbridled license, insist and vociferate that, after we are dead by Christ to the elements of this world… it is unworthy of us to be occupied with those profane and impure cares which relate to matters alien from a Christian man. To what end, they say, are laws without courts and tribunals? But what has a Christian man to do with courts?" This is Schleitheim's Article VI in Calvin's own paraphrase, presented as the "fanatical" position his chapter exists to dismantle.

His refutation runs through the identical scriptural ground the Anabaptists had already claimed. Against the Sermon on the Mount's "resist not evil" (Matthew 5:39), which Schleitheim reads as an absolute prohibition on the sword, Calvin argues that Christ "would have the minds of his followers to be so abhorrent to everything like retaliation" only in their private disposition — a matter of inward equity, not outward policy — and that this "will not prevent them… from using the aid of the magistrate for the preservation of their goods, or… to call for the punishment of the wicked and pestilential man." Against 1 Corinthians 6's condemnation of litigation among believers, which Schleitheim and other Anabaptist writers read as forbidding recourse to

worldly courts altogether, Calvin insists Paul "inveighs… against that madness for litigation, and not absolutely against all kinds of disputes." Against the magistrate's authority to kill, which the Anabaptist confession treats as flatly incompatible with the Church's calling to "not hurt or destroy," Calvin turns directly to the passage this book has already followed through Luther's two 1525 pamphlets: "if we understand that the magistrate, in inflicting punishment, acts not of himself, but executes the very judgments of God, we shall be disencumbered of every doubt… 'He beareth not the sword in vain,' says Paul, 'for he is the minister of God' (Rom. 13:4)."

The same verse, opposite conclusions, and a textual question neither side asked

What should strike a reader of this series most forcefully is not that Calvin and the Anabaptists disagreed — theologians disagree about scripture constantly, and disagreement alone proves nothing about either side's honesty. What should strike the reader is that both sides accepted the same text as simply, unproblematically given, and fought their entire war of interpretation on that shared, unexamined ground. Calvin builds his civil-government theology on Romans 13:1–7 exactly as Luther had. Volume 2 of this series has already argued, on independent textual grounds unconnected to either man's controversy, that this same passage is among the strongest candidates in the entire Pauline corpus for a later, non-Pauline insertion — absent from the reconstructable text of Marcion's Apostolikon, and doing precisely the institutional work (binding an emerging Jesus movement back onto the legitimacy of existing civil and legal order) that this series' broader argument attributes to the second-century proto-orthodox editorial programme.

Calvin never entertained the possibility that the passage he was treating as load-bearing doctrine might itself be an addition. Neither, to be clear, did the Anabaptists — their case against the sword rests on the Sermon on the Mount and on a theology of two kingdoms not unlike Luther's own, not on any argument that Romans 13 is spurious. Both sides, in other words, fought a real and consequential battle over the correct interpretation of a passage that neither side thought to ask whether Paul had written. The dispute that would determine which communities got tolerated and which got hunted for the next century was conducted entirely within the four corners of a text whose own textual history was invisible to every participant.

The charge sheet against Michael Sattler

Schleitheim's principal author did not live to see his own confession reach its second birthday. Michael Sattler, a former Benedictine prior who had left the monastery, married, and joined the Swiss Brethren, was arrested with several companions not long after the February 1527 conference and brought to trial before the Governor of the Austrian territory at Rottenburg. The full charge sheet survives, preserved in the Anabaptist tradition's own martyrology, the Martyrs Mirror, and it is worth reading in full because it does something no amount of later argument can do as efficiently: it shows, in the institution's own words, exactly which of this book's four control mechanisms a single defendant's case could touch at once.

Sattler was charged, among other counts, with acting contrary to imperial mandate; with denying that Christ's body and blood are present in the sacrament; with teaching that infant baptism does not confer salvation; with rejecting extreme unction; and — two counts that matter more to this book than the sacramental disputes — with declaring "that men are not to swear before the authorities," and with holding that if the Turks invaded the country, no resistance should be offered them, and that he "would rather take the field against the Christians than against the Turks." That last charge is worth pausing on. Sattler's nonresistance was not a convenient position that happened to spare him from fighting a popular war; it was absolute enough to extend to the single enemy every Christian power in Europe agreed was the era's ultimate external threat. The court and the chroniclers alike record this as scandalous — not because anyone doubted Sattler's sincerity, but because it refused, in the plainest terms available, the state's most basic claim on its subjects: that in the last resort, the sword belongs to it.

Sattler's own defense, recorded alongside the charges, answers each count directly and without evasion — he affirms the Trinity, denies transubstantiation on textual grounds ("Christ ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of His heavenly Father… if He is in heaven, and not in the bread, He may not be eaten bodily"), and defends the oath-refusal exactly as Schleitheim's Article VII had: on Christ's own words in the Sermon on the Mount. The sentence, handed down on 21 May 1527, ordered that Sattler be delivered to the executioner, his tongue cut out, his body torn twice with red-hot tongs en route to the place of execution and five times more once there, and then

burned to ashes. His companions were beheaded; his wife, after refusing repeated pressure to recant, was drowned a few days later.

The sentence's opening act — silencing the tongue before the body is touched at all — is as literal an illustration as this book will find of an institution responding to a challenge to its textual and doctrinal authority by attacking, first and specifically, the organ of speech. Everything that follows the tongue is punishment for the doctrine and the oath-refusal; the tongue itself is punishment for having spoken at all.

What is actually at stake in this chapter

Set alongside the peasants of Chapter 4, the Anabaptists represent a different application of the same underlying instinct, meeting a structurally identical response from a different confessional authority. The peasants drew a social and economic inference from grace theology — that the freedom Christ gives dissolves feudal hierarchy — and were killed for the inference, not the theology. The Anabaptists draw a different inference from the same broad current of Reformation thought — that direct standing before God dissolves the state's claim to bind the individual conscience through a sworn oath and to demand participation in its violence — and face, as the following chapters will show, an even longer and more geographically dispersed campaign of suppression than the peasants did, precisely because their challenge touches not one but two of the mechanisms this book is tracking: the oath that binds the individual into the chain of civil authority, and the sword that enforces it.

The next chapter turns to the episode that gave Calvin, and every other confessional authority in Europe, all the justification they would ever need to treat that challenge as an existential threat rather than a scriptural disagreement: the sixteen months in 1534 and 1535 when a faction of Anabaptists actually did seize a German city and attempt to build, by force, the kingdom Schleitheim had explicitly renounced trying to build at all.

Chapter 6: Münster and the Manufacture of a Bogeyman

Catholic and Protestant forces, simultaneously killing each other's ordinary believers elsewhere in Germany, set that conflict aside entirely to jointly besiege and destroy the Anabaptist "Kingdom of Münster" — and then used its memory to justify a century of suppression against an unrelated, pacifist tradition that predates it by seven years.

An episcopal city, taken by ballot

Münster was not seized by an invading army. It became Anabaptist by a sequence of ordinary civic events: a Lutheran preacher, Bernhard Rothmann, gradually moved the city's sympathies toward the Reformation and then, further, toward the doctrine of adult rebaptism; Anabaptist sympathizers seized the city hall by force in February 1534, and the annual municipal council election on 23 February 1534 confirmed their control, installing Bernhard Knipperdolling as mayor. What happened next did not stay ordinary for long. The Dutch prophet Jan Matthys had already arrived in early January 1534 and declared Münster the New Jerusalem; over the following weeks well over a thousand adults were rebaptized, roughly a fifth of the city's population. Catholics and Lutherans who refused were expelled from the city — between two and three thousand of them, turned out in the depth of a Westphalian spring with whatever they could carry.

Matthys died three months later, on Easter Sunday 1534, in a suicidal sortie against the besieging forces the Prince-Bishop had by then assembled outside the walls. His successor, Jan van Leiden, proclaimed himself king by divine right and proceeded to dismantle, by force, exactly the structures

Schleitheim's Article VI had renounced trying to touch at all: private property was abolished; a currency-free economy was decreed; and, in a measure that shocked contemporaries across the confessional spectrum, compulsory polygamy was instituted, with van Leiden himself taking between fifteen and sixteen wives. A penal code followed, prescribing beheading for adultery, for blasphemy, and for refusal of the new marriage regime.

The siege that made confessional enemies into allies

For roughly sixteen months, a combined force drew troops from both Catholic and Lutheran territories to besiege the city — an alliance that should, on any purely doctrinal account of the Reformation, have been impossible. Catholic and Protestant soldiers were, in these same years and in some cases these same months, killing each other's ordinary co-religionists over the Eucharist, over justification by faith, over the authority of the papacy. None of that mattered here. Münster fell in June 1535 through betrayal from within, and the retribution that followed was exemplary in the fullest sense of the word: van Leiden, Bernhard Knipperdolling, and Bernhard Krechting were tortured with red-hot tongs and executed in the city's marketplace in January 1536. Their bodies were displayed afterward in iron cages hung from the tower of St Lambert's Church — cages that stayed in place, empty of bone but still hanging as a standing civic warning, for the rest of the century and long after; they came down only when the tower itself was demolished and rebuilt in the 1880s, were re-hung on the new tower before the century was out, and — in a detail that outstrips anything this book needs to argue about long institutional memory — the same three cages are hanging there still.

The confessional cooperation this siege required is itself a data point this book has been building toward since Chapter 4. Catholic and Lutheran authorities did not need to resolve their disagreements about the Eucharist to agree that a movement abolishing private property, replacing marriage with a compulsory polygamous order, and executing dissenters under its own new penal code, had to be destroyed jointly and without delay. Whatever else separated Rome from Wittenberg in 1535, both recognized the same structural threat when they saw it, and neither waited for the other's theology to be settled before acting against it.

Honesty about what Münster actually was

This chapter will not romanticize Münster, and no honest account of the pattern this book documents can afford to. Van Leiden's regime was not a grace-centered utopia crushed by an unforgiving world; it was, on the documentary record, an apocalyptic theocracy that turned totalitarian from the inside well before its external enemies ever breached the walls. Its own subjects were executed for refusing the marriage laws its own prophet-king had decreed. If the triangulation thesis this book is building requires selective sympathy for its case studies, Münster is the case that breaks the requirement immediately, and it should. The siege of Münster is not an injustice this book is asking the reader to feel outraged about. It is something else: a documented instance where an actual, undisputed structural threat existed, was met with immediate and total confessional cooperation, and then did a second piece of work that far outlasted the siege itself.

The manufacture of the bogeyman

That second piece of work is the one this chapter exists to describe. Münster's memory did not stay contained to Münster. Historians of the Radical Reformation are direct about the episode's afterlife: it discredited militant Anabaptism as a category, prompted the movement's peaceful branches — the Mennonite and Hutterite traditions that trace their descent from exactly the Schleitheim confession examined in the previous chapter — to make nonviolence a defining, foundational commitment, and, crucially, gave every magisterial confessional authority in Europe a single, vivid, retroactively-available justification for treating the entire Anabaptist family as an undifferentiated existential threat, whether or not any given congregation had the remotest connection to what happened at Münster.

The chronology makes the injustice of this legacy precise rather than merely rhetorical. Schleitheim was adopted in February 1527. Münster's Anabaptist takeover began in February 1534 — seven years later, in a different country, among people the Schleitheim brethren had no contact with and would have recognized, had they lived to see it, as a betrayal of everything Article VI and Article VII stood for. Michael Sattler, the confession's principal author, had already been tried and executed in Rottenburg in May 1527, on

charges this book's next chapters will examine directly, before Münster's Anabaptist government existed even as an idea. And yet, for the following century, the word "Anabaptist" itself became sufficient warrant, across both Catholic and Protestant jurisdictions, for suspicion, banishment, and execution — regardless of whether the specific congregation in question had ever advocated anything beyond adult baptism, nonresistance, and a refusal to swear a civil oath.

This is the pattern Volume 3 of this series already names in a different register: an institution justifying its own continued authority by pointing to a threat that is real in one narrow instance and then applying the justification indefinitely, to cases the original threat never touched. One faction's genuine and well-documented excess becomes the permanent, unexamined pretext for suppressing an entire, largely unrelated tradition. The following chapters follow that pretext at work — first against a man who died before Münster existed, and then against a Spanish physician whose actual offense had nothing to do with property, marriage, or the sword at all, but with a fourth-century argument about the nature of God that the Reformation, no less than Rome, still considered worth killing over.

Chapter 7: The Trinity Reopened — Servetus

Calvin's Geneva did to Servetus, via completely normal and legally unremarkable sixteenth-century judicial process, what the Catholic Church had done to Trinity-deniers for a millennium — and the Reformed cantons' own cross-confirmation of the verdict shows this was a shared magisterial consensus, not one man's private severity.

A physician reopens a fourth-century argument

Michael Servetus was a Spanish physician of genuine scientific distinction — he is credited, in his medical writings, with an early description of pulmonary blood circulation — who also wrote theology, and who concluded, from his own reading of scripture and the early councils, that the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity had misdescribed God. On Servetus's account, the "persons" of the Trinity were not three eternal, co-equal hypostases but successive modes of God's self-manifestation — a position closer to the ancient modalist tradition than to fourth-century orthodoxy, and one he also connected to a wider argument that Christ's full divine sonship should be dated from the incarnation rather than from eternity. He rejected infant baptism on grounds not far from the Anabaptist position Chapters 5 and 6 have already described.

Volume 2 of this series has already argued, independently of anything to do with Servetus, that the doctrine of the Trinity as settled at Nicaea in 325 developed in substantial part as an answer to the challenge Marcion's two-God framework had posed nearly two centuries earlier — a doctrinal solution engineered to hold together the Creator and the Redeemer as a single God without collapsing back into either Marcion's separation or an undifferenti-

ated unity that could not account for the Father-Son relationship the Gospels describe. Servetus, in 1531 and then at greater length in his 1553 Christianismi Restitutio, reopens exactly that twelve-centuries-old settlement, from a direction with real family resemblance to Marcion's own instinct: a suspicion that later councils, not the earliest texts, had produced the settled formula.

The correspondence, the denunciation, and the arrest

Servetus corresponded with Calvin between 1546 and 1548, at one point sending him a manuscript draft of the work that would eventually be printed at Lyon in 1553. The correspondence did not go well; Calvin later told a colleague that if Servetus ever came to Geneva, he would not leave alive. After the Restitutio's publication, a chain of letters — running in part through Calvin's own associate Guillaume de Trie in Geneva — supplied the Catholic Inquisition at Vienne, in France, with enough material to denounce and arrest Servetus there. Seventeen of Calvin's letters were used as evidence in that Catholic proceeding against a Trinity-denier — itself a detail worth sitting with, since it shows Geneva's Reformed clergy actively assisting a Catholic inquisitorial prosecution the moment the defendant's doctrine, rather than his confession, was the issue at stake.

Servetus escaped from Vienne before sentence could be carried out, and then did something historians still find difficult to explain: he fled toward Italy by way of Geneva, and, while passing through, attended one of Calvin's own sermons. He was recognized and arrested on the spot.

A city council, not a church court — and a continent-wide confirmation

The trial that followed was conducted before Geneva's civil authority, the Small Council, not by any ecclesiastical tribunal — a detail the historiography treats as significant, since it locates the proceeding within ordinary criminal jurisdiction rather than within a specifically ecclesiastical apparatus. Calvin appeared as an expert theological witness, providing testimony and documentary evidence against positions he had already spent years refuting in print, but he held no civil office in Geneva and did not personally issue or carry out the sentence.

What Albert Rilliet's 1846 documentary account of the trial — compiled directly from the surviving Geneva council registers — adds to the record is the detail that matters most for this book's argument: before passing sentence, the Geneva council formally consulted the other Swiss Reformed cantons and cities for their opinion on the case. Every one of them, including Zurich under the comparatively moderate Heinrich Bullinger, returned an opinion endorsing a guilty verdict. This was not Calvin's private vendetta ratified by a compliant local council. It was a position independently confirmed across the entire Reformed confessional network of Switzerland, each city consulted separately and each concurring. Servetus was convicted of anti-Trinitarian doctrine, of denying Christ's eternal sonship, of rejecting infant baptism, and of "causing a schism of faith and church in Geneva," and was burned, together with his books, on the hill of Champel on 27 October 1553.

The mechanism, stripped of the personalities

It is tempting, and historically lazy, to tell this story as being about Calvin — a single severe man exercising a private grudge through judicial murder. The more accurate account is both less dramatic and more damning for this book's purposes. Nearly every European legal-theological tradition in 1553, Catholic and Protestant alike, held that obstinate, publicly unrepented heresy on a matter as foundational as the Trinity warranted the death penalty; Calvin's role in the Servetus case, one recent study of Genevan law notes, sits doctrinally alongside Thomas Aquinas's own centuries-earlier position on the same question. Rome had killed Trinity-deniers for centuries under the same theory of the crime. Geneva, having just broken from Rome specifically over the question of who has the authority to define doctrine, enforced the identical boundary Rome had enforced, by the identical means, within a generation of declaring its independence from Rome's authority to do exactly that.

This is not offered as an excuse. It is offered as the sharper, more useful version of the claim this book is building case by case: the confessional break did not abolish the mechanism that killed Trinity-deniers. It relocated the institution empowered to apply it. Sebastian Castellio, a humanist scholar who had himself been dismissed from a Geneva post a decade earlier and was by then teaching in Basel, saw this clearly enough to publish, the following year, De haereticis, an sint persequendi ("Concerning Heretics, Whether They Are to Be Persecuted"), arguing openly for toleration — proof that dissent from

the persecuting consensus existed even within the Reformed camp itself, at the moment the consensus was applied. It would be three and a half centuries before Geneva's own Calvinist descendants erected, in 1903, a monument at Champel formally acknowledging the execution as an error of its age — inscribed plainly, without a statue, the same kind of narrow, structure-preserving admission Volume 3 of this series has already documented in a very different setting on the other side of the world.

The next chapter turns from the mechanism that polices doctrine to the mechanism that polices the text itself — not who is permitted to believe what about God, but who is permitted to put the grounding document into the hands of an ordinary reader at all.

Chapter 8: Tyndale and the Control of the Text

Tyndale was pursued for over a decade across two jurisdictions for the practical activity of putting an English New Testament into ordinary hands — and the English Crown that hunted him adopted his translation as its own official text within a year of his execution, once direct textual access became more useful to royal authority than dangerous to it.

"I will make the boy that driveth the plough to know more of the scripture"

William Tyndale, an Oxford- and Cambridge-educated priest, asked the English ecclesiastical authorities for permission to translate the New Testament into English and was refused. His own account of the exchange that convinced him to proceed without permission has him telling a senior clergyman that if God spared his life, "ere many years, I will cause a boy that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture" than the clergyman himself did. Unable to do the work in England, he left in 1524 and did not return alive. His English New Testament, translated directly from Erasmus's Greek text rather than from the Latin Vulgate, was printed at Cologne and then completed at Worms in 1525–26, and smuggled into England in merchant shipments. It was the first printed New Testament in English, and its language — cadenced, plain, closer to speech than to Latinate ceremony — supplied, verbatim in many places, the text that would become the King James Version nearly a century later.

Tyndale spent the following decade in exile across Germany and the Low Countries, continuing to translate — much of the Old Testament, directly from

Hebrew, was finished before his death — while both the English Crown and the Catholic authorities of the Low Countries treated him as a marked man. Henry VIII personally ordered Tyndale's "corrupt and untrue translations" burned in England. Copies smuggled across the Channel were seized and destroyed at St Paul's Cross; in one documented episode, the Bishop of London arranged to buy up the entire stock of one printing run in Antwerp specifically in order to burn it, not realizing the purchase money simply financed Tyndale's next edition.

Betrayed, imprisoned, executed — for heresy, not, formally, for translation

In 1535, an Englishman named Henry Phillips, acting for reasons that remain historically murky (financial desperation and a commission from hostile English authorities are both suspected), befriended Tyndale in Antwerp and lured him into the jurisdiction of the Habsburg authorities, where he was arrested. He spent sixteen months imprisoned at Vilvoorde castle, near Brussels, and was executed there on 6 October 1536 — strangled at the stake, by an unusual mercy, before his body was burned, rather than burned alive. His reported last words were a prayer: "Lord, open the King of England's eyes."

A precise and important nuance belongs here, because an inaccurate version of Tyndale's story is common and this book should not repeat it. The formal charges against him at Vilvoorde did not cite Bible translation itself — translating scripture into the vernacular was not, as a matter of positive law, illegal in the Habsburg Netherlands. He was convicted of "Lutheran heresy" in the broader doctrinal sense. But this legal technicality should not be allowed to obscure the practical reality it sits inside: it was Tyndale's translation work, and the ideology of direct, unmediated textual access that animated it — the ploughboy who should know the scripture as well as the clergyman — that made him a hunted man across two separate jurisdictions for over a decade, that put a price on his printed sheets in both England and the Netherlands, and that supplied the doctrinal profile under which he was eventually tried and killed. The charge was heresy in general. The specific, sustained, cross-border activity that made him worth pursuing at that level of institutional effort for that many years was the translation.

Within a year, the Crown adopted what it had just helped kill him for

The single most damning fact in this chapter is not the execution. It is what happened immediately afterward. Within about a year of Tyndale's death, Thomas Cromwell — the same King's minister whose government had spent a decade treating Tyndale's printed sheets as contraband — arranged for the publication of an English Bible substantially built on Tyndale's own translation, printed under the pseudonym "Thomas Matthew" and granted the King's official license in 1537. The Great Bible of 1539, placed by royal order in every parish church in England, is Tyndale's language again, lightly revised. The King James Version of 1611, the text that would define English religious prose for the next four centuries, retains an enormous proportion of Tyndale's actual wording — by some scholarly estimates, a substantial majority of the New Testament's language traces directly back to his hand.

The institution that hunted the translator to death for the crime of putting the text into ordinary hands adopted his translation as its own official instrument of authority within twelve months of burning him, once the political calculation changed — once an English-language Bible became more useful to Henry VIII's break from Rome and his own claim to supreme headship of the English church than it was dangerous to any established order. This is the "self-refuting institution" pattern this series has already named in Volume 3, appearing here in its cleanest and most rapid form: direct textual access is an existential threat to institutional authority for exactly as long as the institution in question does not yet control the channel, and becomes a prized instrument of that same authority the moment it does.

The franchise turns on its own architect: Cranmer

Tyndale shows the mechanism running against an outsider who forced textual access on an institution from below. Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1533, shows it running against the insider who built that same institution's own textual apparatus from above — and it is worth pausing on him precisely because he is not a radical, not a translator working in exile, not a figure the establishment could plausibly disown as a troublemaker. Cranmer compiled the Book of Common Prayer (1549, revised 1552): the first autho-

rized vernacular liturgy of the English church, the textual-mediation project of the magisterial Reformation's own establishment side, as consequential in its sphere as Tyndale's New Testament had been in his. He did for the English church's public worship exactly what this book's argument says the Reformation as a whole was supposed to do for scripture: put the text the institution had previously guarded in Latin directly into the ordinary worshipper's own language and hands.

When Mary I acceded in 1553 and restored Catholic authority, Cranmer — already implicated in the failed attempt to divert the succession to the Protestant Lady Jane Grey — was tried and imprisoned. Over the following two and a half years he produced an escalating series of recantations, the final ones submitting to papal authority outright, apparently in genuine hope of a reprieve. Queen Mary, who held a personal grievance against Cranmer stretching back to his role in annulling her mother's marriage, had already decided otherwise: she secretly instructed Dr. Henry Cole to prepare a funeral sermon for Cranmer's burning in advance of the date set for his supposed public recantation, 21 March 1556, regardless of what he said. The recantations were never going to save him; they were, on the queen's side of the transaction, simply being extracted for their propaganda value before the sentence already decided on was carried out.

What makes the case worth including is what happened at St Mary's Church, Oxford, on the appointed day. Both sides expected Cranmer's presence to close with a final public confirmation of his submission. Instead, having reached the closing paragraph of the expected address, he reversed it in front of the assembled crowd:

> "And now I come to the great thing which so much troubleth my conscience… and that is the setting abroad of a writing contrary to the truth; which now here I renounce and refuse, as things written with my hand contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart… And forasmuch as my hand offended, writing contrary to my heart, my hand shall first be punished therefor; for, may I come to the fire, it shall be first burned."

He was pulled from the pulpit and led directly to the stake, at the same spot where Ridley and Latimer had already been burned under the same regime. Foxe's account, drawing on eyewitnesses, records that he kept his word about the hand:

> "And when the wood was kindled, and the fire began to burn near him, stretching out his arm, he put his right hand into the flame, which he held so steadfast and immovable… that all men might see his hand burned before his body was touched… and oftentimes he repeated 'his unworthy right hand'… and using often the words of Stephen, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,' in the greatness of the flame he gave up the ghost."

The mechanism this chapter has been tracing in Tyndale's case — an institution executing the man who built its own textual-access apparatus, then adopting what he built once the institution's own needs changed — appears here in a mirror form, with the confessional roles reversed. Cranmer was not killed by the church he threatened; he was killed by the church he had, twenty years earlier, helped install, once its confessional identity flipped under a different monarch. His Book of Common Prayer, condemned along with him under Mary, was restored within three years, under Elizabeth I, substantially in the form he had given it, and remains the liturgical foundation of Anglican worship worldwide today. The pattern is not confession-specific and not limited to outsiders challenging an institution from below: whichever authority holds the state's coercive power at a given moment will apply the same tools — recantation, boundary-policing, execution — to whoever it now designates a threat to its version of the text, including, when the wheel turns far enough, the very people who built the previous version.

What this case isolates

Servetus's case, in the previous chapter, was about the boundary of acceptable doctrine — who may say what about the nature of God. Tyndale's case, and Cranmer's alongside it, are about something logically prior to doctrine: who may put the grounding text itself into a reader's hands without licence, and in what language, and who controls the liturgy built from it once that licence is granted. It is the mechanism this series' first two volumes have treated as foundational to the entire argument — textual mediation — caught here at the exact moment of the Reformation when it should, on the movement's own stated principles, have been settled in the ordinary believer's favor once and for all. Luther's sola scriptura said the text belongs to the individual conscience, unmediated by institutional licence. Tyndale acted on that principle with more literal consistency than almost anyone else this book will describe,

translating not just from Latin into English but from the original Greek and Hebrew directly — and it killed him, in a jurisdiction outside the reformer's own country, at the hands of a Catholic government that the English Crown was simultaneously, and for its own reasons, happy to let do the work England's own laws had already tried to do through censorship and book-burning. Cranmer built the establishment's own version of the same access and was killed by the same tool, wielded by a rival confessional authority, twenty years later. Between them, the two cases show that the mechanism does not track any single confession's villainy; it tracks whoever, at a given moment, holds the state's sword and needs a boundary enforced.

The next chapter turns to the one case in this book's core set where the mechanism this book is tracking eventually, after more than three centuries, reversed itself — not through a change of doctrine, but through a change in what the state needed from its subjects, and what a small, persistent, unarmed minority refused, on the same scriptural grounds Schleitheim had already stated in 1527, to give it.

Chapter 9: The Long Tail — Quakers and the Affirmation

The state fully accommodated Quaker oath-refusal within one generation of criminalizing it. The Anabaptist tradition raised the identical objection, on the identical scriptural grounds, 130 years earlier — and was executed for it across Catholic and Protestant jurisdictions alike for a century. The refusal itself was never the threat; a demonstrated, sustained absence of a violent wing is what eventually purchased toleration.

The same refusal, a century and a third later

The Religious Society of Friends, founded by George Fox in the 1650s, arrived at a position on oaths that a reader of Chapter 5 will recognize immediately: a refusal grounded directly in Matthew 5:34–37, "swear not at all," applied without exception to civil as well as religious oaths, and defended on the same theological ground the Schleitheim brethren had used in 1527 — that a believer's word should be reliably yes or no in itself, needing no invocation of God to guarantee it, and that invoking God's name to guarantee a merely worldly transaction was itself the deeper impiety. The Quakers reached this position independently of the continental Anabaptist tradition, more than a century later and in a different country, which makes the convergence itself worth noting: two unrelated movements, working from the same biblical text under similar pressure, arrived at the same conclusion.

England's initial response followed the pattern this book has already documented several times over. The Quaker Act of 1662 made refusal of the Oath of Allegiance a criminal offence; thousands of Quakers were imprisoned under it, and a documented number died in prison as a direct result — Volume

3 of this series has already drawn on this same Act in its own chapter on the architecture of oaths. For the following three decades, English Quakers experienced imprisonment, sequestered estates, and social exclusion as the ordinary cost of maintaining their position, with no legal alternative offered.

The relief, and its precise shape

In 1695, Parliament passed the Quakers Act — "An Act that the Solemne Affirmation and Declaration of the People called Quakers shall be accepted instead of an Oath in the usual Forme." Its preamble states the practical problem plainly: Quakers "refusing to take an Oath in Courts of Justice and other Places are frequently imprisoned and their Estates sequestered… to the Ruine of themselves and Families." The remedy allowed a Quaker to make a solemn affirmation in place of an oath, "of the same Force and Effect… in all Courts of Justice and other Places where by Law an Oath is required… as if such Quaker had taken an Oath in the usual Forme."

The relief was real, but it was also narrow and slow to mature. The 1696 Act excluded criminal cases, jury service, and any Crown office of profit — precisely the contexts where the state's own interest in binding an individual most tightly was highest. Even the civil-case wording retained enough residual reference to God that some Quakers objected it still functioned as a disguised oath in substance; that objection was not fully addressed until a further revision in 1722. The privilege was extended to the Moravians, another oath-refusing sect, in 1749. It took until 1888 for English law to generalize the right to affirm to any person in any proceeding, religious objector or not — the point at which accommodation stopped being a sect-specific carve-out and became a general legal principle. The Oaths Act 1978, still in force, states the final, unremarkable version of the rule: "Any person who objects to being sworn shall be permitted to make his solemn affirmation instead of taking an oath… A solemn affirmation shall be of the same force and effect as an oath."

Reading the timeline as evidence, not as a happy ending

Volume 3 of this series has already made the observation that the state would not have built two centuries of incremental statutory relief around this specific objection if the underlying objection had been frivolous — the accommodation is itself a tacit, century-spanning admission that the original

demand was not being made in bad faith. This chapter adds a sharper point to that observation by placing the Quaker timeline directly alongside the Anabaptist one Chapters 5 and 6 have already documented.

Both movements raised, from the same handful of verses, the identical objection to the identical mechanism: the state's claim to bind an individual's word through an invocation of God's name. The Anabaptist tradition raised it first, at Schleitheim in 1527, and was met, within the following century, with execution across both Catholic and Protestant jurisdictions — a response, as Chapters 5 and 6 have shown, inseparable from the additional charges of rejecting the sacrament and, after 1534, from the reputational shadow Münster cast over the entire Anabaptist name regardless of any individual congregation's actual conduct. The Quakers raised the identical objection in the 1650s and received their first meaningful statutory relief within thirty-four years, in 1695 — one generation, not a century, and without ever facing a period of state-sanctioned mass execution comparable to what the Radical Reformation's first generation endured.

The difference is not that the Quaker objection was more theologically sound, more moderately worded, or more sympathetically presented than Schleitheim's had been a century and a third earlier — read side by side, the two arguments are close to interchangeable. The difference this book's evidence points to is organizational and reputational rather than doctrinal: by the time Quakers were pressing their case in the 1660s and 1670s, they had already established, over an extended and closely observed period, an absolute and consistent record of nonviolence, with no equivalent of Münster's 1534 seizure of a city, its abolition of property, or its compulsory marriage regime anywhere in their own history to be pointed to by an accuser. George Fox and the early Friends went to considerable lengths to make that dissociation explicit and public. The Anabaptist tradition's own founding generation had made an equally explicit dissociation at Schleitheim in 1527 — years before Münster existed even as a possibility — and it did not help them, because the memory that mattered was created seven years later by people they had never met, and outlived by more than a century the movement's own repeated attempts to distance itself from it.

What this chapter completes

Taken together, Chapters 4 through 9 give this book its full working set of case studies: a challenge to the hierarchy mechanism (the peasants), a challenge to the sword and oath mechanisms in a movement's founding theology (Schleitheim and Calvin's Institutes), an actual seizure of civic and social order that hardens the state's response to the entire surrounding tradition (Münster), a challenge to the doctrinal-boundary mechanism (Servetus), a challenge to the textual-mediation mechanism (Tyndale), and, finally, a case where the same challenge to the oath mechanism eventually succeeded — slowly, partially, and only once demonstrated nonviolence had done a full century of reputational work the theology alone had never been enough to do on its own. Part Three of this book turns from these individual cases to the pattern connecting them, tests that pattern honestly against cases that were not suppressed, and states, as precisely as the evidence allows, what it actually predicts.

PART THREE: THE PATTERN AND ITS LIMITS

Chapter 10: The Spectrum — Censure, Banishment, and the Stake

Institutional response to religious dissent is not a binary of "executed or spared." It is a graduated scale, and nineteen coded cases spanning over five centuries — Reformation-era and otherwise — show a real, measurable dose-response pattern against it: the more of four control mechanisms a challenge touches, and the more organized that challenge is, the higher up the scale a case lands.

The objection this chapter exists to answer

Six case studies is a pattern. It is not, by itself, evidence of a correlation. A skeptical reader is entitled to ask whether this book has simply gathered its most dramatic executions and called the result a thesis — five or six men who died badly, arranged to look like a system. That objection is fair, and the only honest way to answer it is to go looking for the cases that would break the pattern if the pattern were false: people and movements who touched the same mechanisms and were not destroyed, and people who caused sharp, public offense while touching none of the mechanisms at all and drew no institutional response whatsoever. This chapter presents that search.

Restating the mechanisms as testable variables

Four control mechanisms have run through every case study in Part Two of this book: textual mediation (T) — an independent claim to translate, interpret, or distribute the grounding text outside institutional licence; doctrinal boundary-policing (D) — public, circulated rejection of a settled Christological or Trinitarian formula; the oath and membership mechanism (O) — refusal of the sworn civil or ecclesial oath that binds an individual into the chain of authority; and the hierarchy and property mechanism (H) — drawing a social or economic entailment from theology rather than confining it to an inward, spiritual register.

The outcome this chapter measures is not a binary. Execution is the ceiling of a spectrum, not a separate category from everything below it. This book codes institutional response on a five-point ordinal scale: 0, no adverse action at all; 1, formal condemnation only — anathema, banned or burned books, doctrine declared heretical, but the person and property untouched; 2, banishment or exile — forced expulsion, loss of position, a life as a wanderer, but no imprisonment or execution; 3, imprisonment, property confiscation, or exile enforced under threat of death; 4, execution.

The comparison cases

Erasmus touched none of the four mechanisms — he criticized clerical abuse sharply and publicly for decades, unorganized, without founding any rival institution — and drew no adverse action in his lifetime at all (0), only a posthumous listing on the 1559 Index. Sebastian Franck and Caspar Schwenckfeld each touched one mechanism (radical anti-institutional rhetoric; heterodox Christology, respectively) but each explicitly declined to found a rival sworn congregation. Both sit at a real, sustained 2: repeated banishment from city after city, formal anathema by name at the 1540 Diet of Schmalkalden, decades as fugitives — genuinely persecuted, but never at the ceiling, because neither ever organized.

John Wycliffe personally, protected for his entire life by the political patronage of John of Gaunt and by Oxford's institutional protection, held the same anti-transubstantiation, pro-vernacular-translation doctrine that would later condemn ordinary people to the stake, and sat at 1 in life: formally

condemned, never touched. Once his patronage was gone and the doctrine had passed to an unprotected population — the Lollards, further tainted a generation later by association with the 1381 Peasants' Revolt — the same doctrine reaches 4: De heretico comburendo in 1401, sustained burnings, and, in the single most literal illustration of the scale's continuity, the exhumation and burning of Wycliffe's own forty-four-year-old corpse in 1428, once no patronage remained to protect even his memory.

The Transylvanian Unitarians under the 1568 Edict of Torda sit at 0 — the identical Trinity-denial that burned Servetus in Geneva the same generation was legalized outright, in the same doctrine, because the surrounding state was fragmented and multipolar rather than confessionally consolidated. Eleven years later, once the ruling prince changed and the state consolidated around a single confessional centre, the same doctrine in the same place reaches 3: Ferenc Dávid, the movement's own leader, convicted of "innovation" and dead in prison. The early Polish Brethren sit at 1 under the decentralized Warsaw Confederation, rising to 3 — expulsion, forced liquidation of communities, a capital penalty for return — exactly at the moment a wartime loyalty crisis forced the Commonwealth to consolidate its own confessional control.

The Waldensians, from the 1170s, combined textual mediation, oath-refusal on the same Matthew 5:33–37 grounds Schleitheim would use three and a half centuries later, and organized, institutionally-competing rival preaching — and drew 4, three centuries of episodic execution and Inquisition, under a Catholic Church facing no Protestant rival whatsoever.

Three further cases sharpen the picture at its edges. Girolamo Savonarola, in Florence, thirty-one years before Luther's theses, ran an organized political-religious faction that seized the city's own government and rewrote its property and sumptuary law on explicitly theocratic grounds, while claiming a prophetic authority that openly overrode the Pope's summons to Rome. It is the same D+H combination, organized the same way, that will put Münster at the ceiling four decades later — and it reaches the same ceiling here, under a joint papal-and-Florentine tribunal that excommunicated, tortured, hanged, and burned him in 1498, with no Protestant/Catholic rivalry as a variable at all.

The Huguenots isolate a variable this comparison set had not yet found. By the 1560s, French Calvinists were not a lone pamphleteer or a single vulnerable congregation but an armed noble faction — Condé, Coligny, later Henry of Navarre — holding fortified towns under prior treaty, with military resources approaching the crown's own. St Bartholomew's Day, 1572, still

reaches the ceiling: five thousand to thirty thousand killed in a few weeks, coordinated at the highest level of the French court. But unlike every other case in this table that touches 4, the movement was not thereby extinguished, because the crown could not sustain a fight it could not decisively win. The eventual equilibrium was the Edict of Nantes (1598) — a negotiated toleration, later revoked in 1685, but real for nearly a century — reached not through moral suasion, as with the Quakers, but through rough coercive parity.

The Diggers, at St George's Hill and then Cobham in 1649–50, drew the identical inference the German peasants had drawn in 1525 — that grace and redemption dissolve property and rank, not merely an inward equality with no outward consequence — from an independent, unlicensed reading of Genesis, under a government that was itself the product of a revolution against the old order: Cromwell's Commonwealth had executed a king five months before Gerrard Winstanley's small commune broke the common ground at St George's Hill. What the peasants had that the Diggers did not was scale and arms. The Diggers touched the hierarchy mechanism in an organized way and drew real, non-trivial harassment — crops destroyed, houses burned by gentry-organized mobs, lawsuits for trespass — but no imprisonment, no execution, and both colonies dispersed within about a year on their own, for want of the numbers and weapons that turned Swabia into a slaughter. Under a government born from the reforming side's own revolution, the same inference that killed a hundred thousand people twelve decades earlier cost the Diggers a burned house and a broken commune.

What the pattern actually says

Erasmus (0 mechanisms, unorganized) sits at 0. Franck and Schwenckfeld (1 mechanism, explicitly unorganized) sit at a real, sustained 2 — never safe, never at the ceiling. Torda's Unitarians (2+ mechanisms, organized, but under a fragmented state) sit at 0, then rise to 3 only once the state consolidates. Sattler, Servetus, Tyndale, and the peasants — cases combining an organized, institutionally-competing challenge with the oath, doctrinal-boundary, textual, or hierarchy mechanism, under a consolidated confessional state — sit at the ceiling, 4. This is not a threshold effect where any dissent above a certain volume gets killed. It is a genuine dose-response gradient across five distinguishable rungs, and it holds up case by case rather than only in the aggregate.

Four variables, not one, are doing the work: how many mechanisms a challenge touches; whether it is organized into a rival, institutionally-competing structure rather than voiced individually; the surrounding state's current consolidation and capacity, or the challenger's elite patronage; and, at the edges of the table, the challenger's own coercive capacity relative to the state's. Doctrinal deviance alone, however loud, however public, caps the response at the lower-to-middle rungs of the scale. It is organizing on the oath and hierarchy axis, under a state that currently has both the capacity and the motive to act, that pushes a case to the ceiling — and, per the Huguenot case, it is the challenger's own capacity to resist that determines whether a state can sustain that ceiling once it is reached.

This is a more defensible claim than the simpler, single-variable version of the thesis this book might have been tempted to state after Part Two alone. It is also, honestly, a more complicated one — now a four-variable claim, once the challenger's own coercive capacity (the Huguenot case) is added to mechanism count, organization, and state consolidation or elite patronage — and a claim this complicated invites a real question about whether it has been built to explain anything after the fact. Chapter 13 will take that objection on directly rather than leaving it for a critical reader to raise unassisted. For now, the result stands: nineteen coded cases, a real spectrum, and a pattern that survives contact with its own contrast cases rather than dissolving on them. The next chapter states, formally and citationally, what that pattern predicts.

Chapter 11: What the Pattern Predicts

Institutional response intensity tracks the number of control mechanisms a challenge touches, whether the challenge is organized into a rival institution, the surrounding state's consolidation or the challenger's elite patronage, and — at the edges of the pattern — the challenger's own coercive capacity relative to the state's. None of this is this series' discovery — it converges with independent academic literatures — but the specific route from a second-century textual argument to a sixteenth-century killing pattern is.

The thesis, stated once, precisely

Institutional violence in the confessional century this book examines did not track theological offensiveness as such. It tracked a specific, identifiable convergence of factors: first, how many of four control mechanisms — textual mediation, doctrinal boundary-policing, the oath and membership mechanism, and the hierarchical and property order — a given challenge touched; second, whether that challenge was organized into a rival, institutionally-competing structure (a sworn congregation, an armed movement, a printing and distribution network) rather than voiced by an individual acting alone; third, whether the surrounding state currently had both the consolidated capacity and the confessional motive to act, or whether the challenger enjoyed elite patronage that placed the case beyond the state's immediate reach; and fourth, whether the challenger itself commanded enough independent coercive capacity — an army, fortified towns, a noble power base — to make a ceiling response costly to sustain rather than simply costly to inflict. A

challenge scoring high on the first two factors, in a state that also scores high on the third, reaches the ceiling of Chapter 10′s spectrum. A challenge scoring low on any one of them does not — regardless of how radical, how public, or how sincerely held the underlying doctrine is. A challenge scoring high on the fourth factor as well may still touch the ceiling at its most acute moment, as the Huguenots did, but the state's ability to hold it there is a separate question the first three factors do not by themselves answer.

This produces a specific, falsifiable prediction, and Chapter 10 has already tested it: doctrinal deviance by itself, unorganized, should draw condemnation but rarely worse (Schwenckfeld, Franck). Organizational threat without doctrinal or oath content should draw a harder response than pure speech but nothing like the ceiling. The combination — organized, mechanism-touching, under a consolidated state — should be the only configuration that reliably reaches execution. It is.

This is not a new observation, and it should not be presented as one

Three independent, well-established academic literatures converge on substantially this claim, from directions that owe nothing to this series' own argument, and citing them honestly is a matter of basic intellectual practice rather than a concession.

R. I. Moore's persecuting society thesis argues that the systematic identification and suppression of heretics, Jews, and lepers in medieval and early modern Europe served the consolidation of centralizing political and ecclesiastical power at least as much as it served any genuine doctrinal threat — that persecution is, in significant part, a technology elites use to build authority, not merely a reaction to danger elites merely happen to notice. René Girard's account of the scapegoat mechanism describes how societies under internal strain resolve accumulated tension by directing collective violence at a vulnerable target, and how that violence, rather than being recognized as arbitrary, gets retroactively justified as a necessary response to a real threat the victim is said to have posed. The Reinhard–Schilling confessionalization thesis, developed independently by German historians studying both Catholic and Protestant territories after the Reformation, describes parallel processes of church-building and state-building in which religious uniformity became an instrument of social discipline and state control, regardless of

which confession happened to be doing the disciplining. Brad Gregory's The Unintended Reformation extends this into the modern period, arguing that the confessional fragmentation the Reformation produced — not any single reformer's intent — pushed the management of religious difference toward the state and contributed, over the following centuries, to the secularization of public life.

None of these scholars needed this series' argument about interpolation and textual history to reach their conclusions. Moore worked from Inquisition records and heresy trials. Girard worked from anthropology and literary theory. Gregory and the confessionalization historians worked from institutional and social history. The fact that a book beginning from a completely different starting point — the textual history of the Pauline corpus — arrives at a structurally compatible description of the same historical events is evidence the underlying pattern is real, not evidence that this series discovered it first. This book claims originality for exactly one thing: the specific, connective argument running from the interpolation thesis (Volumes 1–2), through the oath architecture and canon-as-political-product argument (Volume 3), to the Reformation's relocation, rather than resolution, of the same load-bearing mechanisms (this volume). It does not claim to have discovered that Reformation-era violence had structural causes. That has been established, from several directions, for decades.

Relocated, not removed

Gregory's central claim — that the Reformation did not intend to secularize European society but nonetheless transferred religious authority's practical enforcement from a single Church to a plurality of confessional states — is directly supported, not merely echoed, by the Waldensian case Chapter 10 introduced. The mechanism this book has traced through six Reformation-era case studies is demonstrably older than the Reformation and demonstrably outlives any one confession: the Waldensians drew the ceiling response from a purely Catholic hierarchy facing no Protestant rival at all, three and a half centuries before Luther, using the identical combination of textual independence and oath-refusal that would recur at Schleitheim in 1527. The confessional split of the sixteenth century did not invent the mechanism. It multiplied the number of institutions authorized to apply it, and, for a period, intensified the frequency with which the required conditions — an organized,

mechanism-touching challenge meeting a newly consolidating confessional state — were satisfied simultaneously across a fractured continent.

This is the sense in which the Reformation, on this book's account, did not resolve the question Volume 3 closed with — by what authority? — so much as multiply the number of authorities prepared to give the same answer. The final chapters of this book turn to what that means: first, honestly, to where the pattern's own edges are, including the one case this book will not let itself use as supporting evidence; then to the objections a careful reader should still be raising; and finally to what it would mean, in light of all of this, actually to deliver the thing neither Rome nor the Reformation ever did.

Chapter 12: The Limits of the Pattern — Luther's Antisemitism

This chapter marks, deliberately, where the triangulation thesis stops. Luther's 1543 attack on the Jews is not a sixth data point for the pattern this book has been building — it is a different mechanism entirely, and a book that studied one while quietly ignoring the other would be committing exactly the selective attention it accuses its subjects of.

The disanalogy, stated before it needs to be

Every case in Part Two of this book shares one feature: the person or movement at its centre did something. Michael Sattler organized a congregation that refused the civil oath and refused, without exception, to take up the sword even against the Ottoman armies every Christian power in Europe agreed were the era's ultimate external threat. Servetus published a rejection of the Trinity that Nicaea had been built, twelve centuries earlier, to close off. The peasants took Luther's own "grace alone" theology as license to challenge feudal hierarchy in the material world rather than confining it to an inward, spiritual register. Tyndale put the Greek and Hebrew text into English hands the institution had not licensed. In every case, institutional violence responded to an act — a specific, identifiable challenge to one or more of the four control mechanisms this book has traced — and in every case, however unjustly, the person could in principle have avoided the response by not making that particular move. That is the entire argument of this book: violence tracked the mechanism, not the doctrine's mere existence.

Luther's 1543 treatise On the Jews and Their Lies does not fit that pattern, and this book will not pretend that it does. Its targets had done nothing of the kind this book's other chapters describe. Jewish communities in Luther's Saxony were not petitioning to found a rival sworn congregation, not publishing a rejection of a Christological formula aimed at Christian doctrine, not marching on manor houses, not smuggling unlicensed vernacular translations across a border. They were the fixed, inherited object of a mechanism that operates on ancestry and religion rather than on any specific challenge to anyone's institutional authority — the mechanism René Girard describes as the scapegoat who is blamed for a crisis without having caused it, selected because a group is available and already marked as other, not because it acted. This chapter exists because both mechanisms operated in the same movement, in the same decades, in the case of Luther's antisemitism sometimes in the very same man who is this book's central figure in Part One. A book that traced one mechanism in careful detail while passing silently over the other would be exercising precisely the kind of selective, self-serving attention this book accuses medieval and early modern institutions of exercising toward their own history.

What actually happened, and when

Luther's relationship to Jewish communities was not static across his career. In earlier writings, into the mid-1530s, he expressed hope that Jews would convert to his reformed Christianity once its truth was properly presented to them, together with some genuine sympathy for their historical treatment under Catholic rule. That hope curdled. After Rabbi Josel of Rosheim's attempt to secure Luther's intercession against an expulsion order failed, and after Luther's broader expectation of mass Jewish conversion to the Reformation went unmet, his rhetoric turned sharply and permanently hostile. On the Jews and Their Lies, published in 1543, is a sixty-five-thousand-word treatise that calls Jews a "base, whoring people" and recommends, in concrete and specific terms: the burning of synagogues and Jewish religious books, the razing of homes, a ban on rabbis preaching, the confiscation of property, forced labor, and expulsion "for all time." At one point he states that Christians are "at fault in not slaying them" — language whose precise force scholars still debate, but which no honest account of the text can soften into ambiguity.

The historiographical debate this book will not resolve for rhetorical convenience

Two serious, mutually inconsistent scholarly positions exist on the treatise's long-term influence, and this chapter represents both rather than choosing the one that makes for a tidier argument. The prevailing postwar view, and the explicit self-presentation of the Nazi regime itself — which displayed the treatise at party rallies, and in 1937 arranged for Julius Streicher, publisher of the antisemitic newspaper Der Stürmer, to receive a presentation copy — holds that Luther's text exercised a substantial and largely continuous influence on German antisemitism through to the Holocaust. Against this, the historian Johannes Wallmann has argued that the treatise was, in fact, largely ignored for roughly three centuries after its publication — not translated into English until 1971 — and that its twentieth-century prominence reflects a later act of völkisch and Nazi appropriation, reaching back to claim a respectable German religious pedigree for an ideology that did not, in fact, descend from it in any continuous line of transmission. Hans Hillerbrand cautions against a Luther-centred account altogether, pointing to the much broader currents of German history that produced twentieth-century antisemitism independent of any one sixteenth-century text. This is a live, unsettled question among historians, and it will not be settled by this book choosing whichever answer better suits an argument about something else entirely.

One further, much more tentative connection is worth a single sentence, no more: some scholars read Luther's 1543 polemic as aimed, at least in part, at Catholic claims to authoritative interpretation of the Old Testament — a proxy battle over scriptural authority fought through an attack on the text's other traditional claimants. If this reading has merit, it places the treatise at a considerable remove within this book's own broader concern with who controls the interpretation of a shared text. It does not make the antisemitism explicable. It does not make it excusable. It is offered here only because omitting a genuinely available scholarly reading, in either direction, would itself be a form of the selective attention this chapter opened by refusing to practice.

Why this chapter exists at all

This book's central claim — that institutional violence in this period tracked structural challenges to four identifiable mechanisms of control — gains credibility, not damage, from stating plainly where it does not apply. The alternative, quietly excluding this material and hoping a careful reader does not notice, would be worse than dishonest; it would suggest the thesis needs the exclusion to survive. It does not. The triangulation pattern accounts for what happened to Sattler, Servetus, the peasants, and Tyndale precisely because they did something the pattern can specify in advance. It does not account for, and was never built to account for, what happened to a population that did nothing at all. Both things are true of the same historical period, sometimes of the same theologian, and a reader should finish this chapter no less confident in Chapters 4 through 11 than before — and considerably more confident that this book knows the difference between a pattern and an excuse.

The next chapter turns to the objections a careful reader should still be raising against the pattern itself, on its own terms.

Chapter 13: The Strongest Objections

Following this series' own convention, this chapter states the hardest objections to this book's argument in the strongest form a critical reader could put them, and answers each honestly rather than defensively.

"Isn't this just cherry-picking dramatic executions?"

This is the single most serious weakness this book's argument has to answer, and Chapter 10 exists specifically to meet it rather than merely concede it. The five case studies in Part Two were chosen because they are dramatic and well-documented — which illustrates a pattern but does not test one. Chapter 10's comparison set — Erasmus, Franck, Schwenckfeld, the Transylvanian Unitarians before and after Torda, the Polish Brethren, Wycliffe against the later Lollards, the Waldensians, Savonarola, the Huguenots, the Diggers — was built specifically to find cases that would break the pattern if the pattern were false, and it did not break. This moves the argument from six dramatic illustrations to a graduated dose-response pattern across nineteen coded cases — a materially stronger evidentiary position than a handful of examples could provide on their own. It is not, and should not be presented as, an exhaustive census. A genuinely rigorous version of this claim would require a systematic database of every recorded heresy proceeding in a defined region and period — a project beyond what a book of this scope can undertake. What this book can honestly claim is that the obvious, well-documented candidate counter-examples exist, were sought out rather than avoided, and produced a pattern consistent with the thesis rather than one that contradicts it.

"Confessionalization happened in Catholic territories with no Reformation too — so is this really about Protestantism, or just early-modern state formation generally?"

It is, honestly, more the second than the first, and this book should say so directly rather than treat the observation as a concession extracted under pressure. The Waldensian case in Chapter 10 settles this cleanly: the identical combination of textual independence and organized oath-refusal that recurs at Schleitheim in 1527 was already drawing the ceiling response from a purely Catholic hierarchy facing no Protestant rival at all, three and a half centuries earlier. The mechanism this book traces predates the Reformation and outlives any single confession. The sixteenth-century confessional split is the best-documented and most concentrated instance of the mechanism operating, not its point of origin. Reframed this way, the objection becomes supporting evidence: a pattern that operates identically under Catholic hegemony, Protestant hegemony, and fractured multiconfessional states alike is a stronger candidate for a real structural mechanism than one that only appears once, under one confession, in one century.

"Isn't 'grace vs. law' just a theological gloss on ordinary power politics that would have happened anyway?"

This deserves a direct answer rather than a dodge. Some of what this book describes would very plausibly have happened in some form regardless of theological content — states have consolidated power against organized rivals, and elites have suppressed movements threatening the existing distribution of property and status, in societies with entirely different religious systems or none at all. But the theological content is doing real, specific, traceable work in every case study this book has examined, not merely dressing up an underlying political conflict that would look identical without it. The peasants did not simply want more land; they argued, with textual citations, that Christ's freedom entailed the abolition of serfdom, and Luther's rebuttal engaged that argument on its own theological ground rather than simply asserting princely interest. Sattler's charge sheet cites specific doctrinal and scriptural positions, not merely disobedience. The content of the doctrine determined which mechanism a given challenge activated and therefore, per Chapter 10′s

own data, the shape and intensity of the institutional response — a purely political-interest account, without the theological specifics, could not have predicted that Schwenckfeld's Christological radicalism would draw a 2 while Sattler's oath-refusal combined with sacramental heterodoxy would draw a 4. The theology is not decoration on a power struggle. It is the variable that determines which mechanism gets triggered and by how much.

"Why does the Trinity/oath/text/hierarchy typology hold together — couldn't you carve the four categories differently?"

Yes, in principle, a different four-part or five-part typology could be constructed from the same cases, and this book does not claim its categories are the only possible carving of the evidence. What can be defended is that these four categories are not arbitrary: each one corresponds to a distinct, independently identifiable institutional function — who interprets and transmits the grounding text; who polices the boundary of acceptable belief about God; who administers the sworn commitment that binds an individual into a chain of authority; and who owns the legitimate distribution of social rank and property — and each of Part Two's six case studies maps cleanly onto one or more of these functions without needing to be forced. A reader who prefers a different carving is invited to recode Chapter 10′s table under their own scheme; the underlying claim this book is actually making — that organized, institutionally-competing challenges to the state's foundational control functions draw disproportionately severe responses, regardless of exactly how many named categories those functions are sorted into — should survive a different taxonomy intact.

"Doesn't adding state-capacity, elite-patronage, and challenger-capacity as moderating variables just make this unfalsifiable — can't you explain any outcome after the fact by picking the right combination?"

This is the sharpest objection in this chapter, because it targets Chapter 10′s own refinement rather than the book's opening claim, and it deserves a real answer rather than a rhetorical one. The answer is that the moderating

variables were specified, and the cases were coded against them, using facts established independently in the historical record — the Edict of Torda's date and content, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's documented wartime crisis, Wycliffe's documented relationship with John of Gaunt, the Huguenot nobility's documented prior possession of fortified towns and independent military command under treaty — not inferred backward from the persecution outcome each variable is then used to explain. State consolidation, elite patronage, and challenger coercive capacity are observable, dateable historical facts in their own right; a critical reader can check, in each case, whether the state genuinely did consolidate, the patronage genuinely did lapse, or the challenger genuinely did hold independent military resources at the time this book claims it did, independent of the outcome. The honest cost, acknowledged directly rather than minimized, is that a four-variable claim is more complex and harder to state crisply than a one-variable claim would be. That is a real cost to rhetorical simplicity. It is not a cost to the claim's truth, and preferring a simpler claim that the evidence does not actually support would be a worse trade than accepting the more complicated one that does.

The final chapter returns to the question this entire series has been building toward, and asks what the Reformation's own answer to it turned out to be.

Chapter 14: The Franchise

The Reformation is history's largest-scale real attempt to answer the question Volume 3 closed with — by what authority? — and the answer it gave, in practice, was relocation rather than resolution: one Roman warrant became many territorial ones, each re-swearing the same inherited, still-interpolated text.

The question this series has been asking since Volume 1

Volume 3 of this series ended by asking the question its entire preceding argument had been building toward: by what authority does an institution that has demonstrably edited its own founding text, and that has used the edited version to underwrite the dispossession of continents, continue to exercise the authority it claims? This volume has asked a narrower version of the same question, aimed at the one moment in European history when a large fraction of Christendom seemed to answer it by simply walking away. What did the reformers actually do, once Rome's authority was no longer the only option on the table?

The honest answer, on the evidence Chapters 1 through 13 have assembled, is that they relocated the mechanism rather than dismantling it. Luther's protest against the indulgence trade was a genuine, well-founded grace-principle objection to a transactional abuse — Chapter 1 gave that beginning its full due, and it deserves to be remembered as real. But the text he appealed to over Rome's head arrived in his hands already shaped by a century and a half of institutional editing his own method never thought to interrogate, and within six years of his ninety-five theses, he was using that text's own inherited Romans 13 to authorize the killing of a hundred thousand

peasants who had drawn a social inference from his theology he had not intended and would not permit. Calvin built the foundational civil-government theology of the Reformed tradition explicitly against Anabaptists who had reached, independently, something close to Marcion's own instinct about the incompatibility of the sword with the kingdom of grace — and enforced, against Servetus, the identical Trinitarian boundary Rome had enforced for a millennium, confirmed not by one man's severity but by every Reformed canton consulted. Tyndale carried sola scriptura to its most literally consistent conclusion, translating directly from Greek and Hebrew into the ploughboy's own language, and was killed for it in a Catholic jurisdiction while the English Crown that had also hunted him quietly prepared to adopt his translation as its own instrument of authority within the year.

One warrant becomes many

Before the Reformation, one institution claimed the authority to define doctrine, license the text, administer the sacraments that bound a soul into the church's account, and bless the sword that defended the resulting order — a single warrant, contested at its edges but never seriously multiplied. After the Reformation, that warrant did not disappear. It was issued again, independently, by Wittenberg, by Geneva, by Zurich, by Canterbury, and by every territorial prince and city council who adopted one confession or another as the law of their own jurisdiction — each new authority re-swearing, re-licensing, and re-enforcing boundaries drawn from the same inherited canon, complete with the same Romans 13, the same household codes, the same doctrine of a Creator whose law must be satisfied rather than simply set aside. This is the sense in which the word this chapter uses for the Reformation — franchise — is not a rhetorical flourish. A franchise does not compete with the parent brand's product; it reproduces it, under new local management, with the same underlying formula, adapted only enough to fit a new territory's particular market. Wittenberg, Geneva, and Canterbury each built a local version of the same operation Rome had run, using the same base text Rome's own editorial tradition had shaped, enforcing overlapping boundaries with the same tools — anathema, banishment, imprisonment, and, when the challenge reached the ceiling of Chapter 10′s spectrum, the stake.

Confessionalization scholarship has already described the mechanics of this multiplication in careful institutional detail; Brad Gregory has already

argued that it pushed the management of religious difference toward the territorial state and, over the following centuries, toward the state's eventual secularization. This book's specific contribution is to trace the multiplication back to its textual root: the reason each new confessional authority reached, independently, for the same tools — the same proof-texts, the same doctrine of civil obedience, the same boundary around acceptable Trinitarian formula — is that each one inherited, unexamined, the same edited canon, shaped over the same second-century editorial process Volumes 1 and 2 of this series describe in detail. The Reformation multiplied the number of institutions authorized to answer "by what authority?" It did not multiply the number of foundational texts they were authorized to answer from.

What neither Rome nor the Reformation delivered

Volume 3 of this series closes its own argument with a constructive chapter, "How the Other Architecture Actually Runs," describing what a genuinely grace-centered order — one that did not require law's satisfaction, did not require an oath's binding, did not require a hierarchy's preservation, did not require an institution standing between a believer and the text — would actually look like, if anyone ever built it rather than merely gesturing toward it from within an institution that could not afford to. This volume's answer to its own question is that neither Rome nor the Reformation ever built that thing, because neither one, at the moment of decision, was willing to let the recovered instinct go all the way down into the text itself. Luther recovered the instinct and stopped at the canon. Calvin recovered enough of the instinct to break with Rome and used the canon's own inherited authority to enforce a new set of boundaries nearly as absolute as the old ones. The Anabaptists came closer than anyone else this book has described — refusing the oath, refusing the sword, refusing the hierarchy — and were killed for it across every confession that had the power to do so, in numbers and for a duration that make their nearest Reformation-era analogue not Luther or Calvin but Marcion himself: a movement that took the grace-over-law instinct further than any institution, old or new, was prepared to survive.

What would be different about actually delivering it — a grace that does not stop at the edge of the inherited text, that examines its own foundations with the same rigor it applies to its opponents', that refuses law's satisfaction and the oath's binding and the hierarchy's preservation all the way through

rather than only far enough to unseat one particular set of officeholders — is the question this series has been assembling the evidence to ask honestly for four volumes now. This book does not answer it. It only shows, case by case, century by century, institution by institution, exactly how far every attempt made so far has stopped short, and exactly why: not for want of courage in the individuals who tried, several of whom paid for the attempt with everything they had, but because none of them ever went back to ask whether the text they were standing on had already, quietly, made the answer come out the same way in advance.

Appendix A: Timeline, 1170s–1978

A single chronology, spanning the pre-Reformation origin of the mechanism this book traces through its long resolution in English law. Cases from the comparison set (Appendix E) are placed alongside the main case studies (Chapters 4–9) to show the mechanism's span before and after the Reformation proper.

1170s–1500s — The Waldensian movement (Peter Waldo, Lyon) combines vernacular scriptural translation, organized rival preaching, and Matthew 5:33–37 oath-refusal; draws intermittent, episodic Inquisition and execution under a Catholic hierarchy facing no confessional rival. (Ch. 10; Appendix E)

1370s–1384 — John Wycliffe, protected by John of Gaunt and Oxford, advances vernacular Bible translation and denies transubstantiation; formally condemned but personally untouched. (Ch. 10; Appendix E)

1381 — The Peasants' Revolt in England; later, unfairly, taints the Lollard movement by association.

1382 — The Blackfriars Council condemns Wycliffite doctrine.

1401 — De heretico comburendo enacted in England; sustained burning of unprotected Lollards begins.

1409 — Oxford bans unlicensed vernacular scripture translation.

1428 — Wycliffe's forty-four-year-old corpse exhumed and burned by order of the Council of Constance's ruling, once no elite patronage remains to protect even his memory.

1515	Pope Leo X proclaims the St Peter's indulgence, secretly financing Archbishop Albrecht of Brandenburg's debt to the Fugger bank. (Ch. 1)
31 October 1517	Luther circulates the Ninety-Five Theses against indulgence sales. (Ch. 1)
1520	Luther's Freedom of a Christian.
1521	Luther condemned at the Diet of Worms.
1523	Luther's Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed grounds civil obedience in Romans 13 and states the "Two Kingdoms" doctrine, two years before it is tested. (Ch. 2)
Winter 1524–25	The Swabian peasants draft the Twelve Articles.
April 1525	Luther's An Admonition to Peace concedes several peasant grievances as "fair and just" while invoking Romans 13:2 against armed resistance. (Ch. 4)
May 1525	Luther's Against the Murderous, Thieving Hordes of Peasants calls for the peasants' extermination on Romans 13 grounds. The German Peasants' War ends with an estimated 100,000 dead. (Ch. 4)
24 February 1527	The Schleitheim Confession is adopted; Article VI renounces the sword, Article VII renounces the oath. (Ch. 5)
21 May 1527	Michael Sattler, principal author of Schleitheim, is tried and executed at Rottenburg: tongue cut out, body torn with hot tongs, burned. (Ch. 5)
5 January 1534	Jan Matthys arrives at Münster and declares it the New Jerusalem; well over a thousand adults are rebaptized in the following weeks, roughly a fifth of the city's population. (Ch. 6)
23 February 1534	Anabaptist sympathizers win the annual municipal council election at Münster, confirming their control; 2,000–3,000 Catholics and Lutherans are expelled. (Ch. 6)
5 April 1534 (Easter Sunday)	Matthys is killed in a suicidal sortie against the besieging forces; Jan van Leiden succeeds him and proclaims himself king. (Ch. 6)

1534–35	Jan van Leiden's kingship, abolition of property, compulsory polygamy; a combined Catholic–Lutheran army besieges the city for roughly sixteen months.
June 1535	Münster falls by betrayal.
January 1536	Van Leiden, Knipperdolling, and Krechting tortured and executed; their bodies caged on St Lambert's Church tower — cages later re-hung on the rebuilt tower in the 1890s and still hanging there today. (Ch. 6)
1524–1536	William Tyndale translates the New Testament (printed Cologne/Worms, 1525–26) and part of the Old Testament in exile. (Ch. 8)
1533	Thomas Cranmer becomes Archbishop of Canterbury. (Ch. 8)
1535	Tyndale betrayed by Henry Phillips in Antwerp; arrested by Habsburg authorities.
6 October 1536	Tyndale executed at Vilvoorde: strangled, then burned. (Ch. 8)
1537	Thomas Cromwell licenses "Matthew's Bible," substantially Tyndale's own translation, within roughly a year of his execution.
1539	The Great Bible, built on Tyndale's text, placed in every English parish church by royal order.
1549 / 1552	Cranmer compiles the Book of Common Prayer, the English church's first authorized vernacular liturgy. (Ch. 8)
1553	Mary I accedes; Cranmer, implicated in the attempt to divert the succession to Lady Jane Grey, is imprisoned and tried. (Ch. 8)
21 March 1556	Cranmer, having secretly been condemned regardless of his recantations, publicly renounces them at St Mary's, Oxford, and is burned the same day, thrusting his "unworthy right hand" into the flame first. (Ch. 8)
1559	Elizabeth I restores the Book of Common Prayer, substantially in Cranmer's form.
1546–48	Michael Servetus corresponds with Calvin; sends a draft of the Christianismi Restitutio. (Ch. 7)

1553 — The Restitutio published at Lyon; Servetus denounced to the Vienne Inquisition, escapes, flees toward Geneva.

27 October 1553 — Servetus tried before Geneva's Small Council, with Calvin as expert witness and every Swiss Reformed canton concurring; burned at Champel. (Ch. 7)

1554 — Sebastian Castellio publishes De haereticis, an sint persequendi, arguing for toleration, from within the Reformed camp itself.

1555 — The Peace of Augsburg establishes cuius regio, eius religio.

1559 — Final Latin edition of Calvin's Institutes, including Book IV, Chapter 20′s sustained refutation of "the frantic proceedings of the Anabaptists." (Ch. 5)

1568 — The Edict of Torda legalizes the Trinity-denial that killed Servetus fifteen years earlier, under Transylvania's fragmented, multipolar state. (Ch. 10; Appendix E)

1571–79 — Once Transylvania consolidates under a re-Catholicizing ruler, Ferenc Dávid is convicted of doctrinal "innovation" and dies in prison. (Appendix E)

1565–1638 — The early Polish Brethren (Socinians) are tolerated under the decentralized Warsaw Confederation. (Appendix E)

1611 — The King James Version, retaining much of Tyndale's language verbatim.

1612 — Castellio's Contra libellum Calvini, a direct rebuttal of Calvin's Defensio, published posthumously.

1620s–1650s — George Fox and the early Religious Society of Friends adopt an oath-refusal position independently derived from Matthew 5:34–37. (Ch. 9)

1638 — Polish Brethren presses suppressed as Commonwealth confessional control tightens.

1648 — The Peace of Westphalia ends the Thirty Years' War.

1655–58 — The Polish Brethren expelled from the Commonwealth under wartime crisis. (Appendix E)

1662 — The Quaker Act criminalizes oath refusal in England; mass imprisonment follows. (Ch. 9)

1695/96 — The Quakers Act grants statutory relief, permitting affirmation in civil cases — thirty-four years after criminalization. (Ch. 9)

1701–1715 — The Affirmation privilege extended and made permanent; extended to Scotland.

1722 — Affirmation wording revised to remove the residual God-reference.

1749 — The affirmation privilege extended to Moravians.

1888 — The Oaths Act generalizes the right to affirm to all persons, religious objector or not.

1903 — Geneva's Calvinist descendants erect a monument at Champel acknowledging the Servetus execution as an error, without a statue.

1543 — Luther publishes On the Jews and Their Lies. (Ch. 12)

1937 — Julius Streicher receives a presentation copy of Luther's 1543 treatise from the Nazi regime.

1971 — First English translation of On the Jews and Their Lies published.

1978 — The Oaths Act (UK, currently in force) states the final, general form of the affirmation rule. (Ch. 9)

Appendix B: Primary Source Excerpts

Curated excerpts from the primary sources this volume draws on. Formatted to the series' existing quotation and citation conventions; ellipses mark omitted material within a single source, not omitted sources.

B.1 — Luther, the Ninety-Five Theses (31 October 1517)

45. "Christians are to be taught that he who sees a man in need, and passes him by, and gives his money for pardons, purchases not the indulgences of the pope, but the indignation of God."
82. "Why does not the pope empty purgatory, for the sake of holy love and of the dire need of the souls that are there, if he redeems an infinite number of souls for the sake of miserable money with which to build a Church?"

Source: standard CCEL English translation of the Latin original. See Chapter 1.

B.2 — Luther, Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed (1523)

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God… Now observe, these people [true believers] need no temporal law or sword… All who are not Christians belong to the kingdom of the world and are under the law…

> In the same way a savage wild beast is bound with chains and ropes so that it cannot bite and tear as it would normally do… The temporal government has laws which extend no further than to life and property and external affairs on earth, for God cannot and will not permit anyone but himself to rule over the soul."

Source: CSS/ISN translation. See Chapter 2.

B.3 — Luther, An Admonition to Peace (April 1525)

> "The other articles recite physical grievances, such as Leibfall, imposts and the like; and they, too, are fair and just. For rulers are not instituted in order that they may seek their own profit and self-will, but in order to provide for the best interests of their subjects. Flaying and extortion are, in the long run, intolerable… [yet] the fact that the rulers are wicked and unjust does not excuse tumult and rebellion, for to punish wickedness does not belong to everybody, but to the worldly rulers who bear the sword."

Source: C. M. Jacobs translation, Works of Martin Luther. See Chapter 4.

B.4 — Luther, Against the Murderous, Thieving Hordes of Peasants (May 1525)

> "First they have sworn to their true and gracious rulers to be submissive and obedient… But since they have deliberately and sacrilegiously abandoned their obedience… they have thereby forfeited body and soul… Have mercy on these poor people! Stab, smite, slay, whoever can. If you die in doing it, well for you! A more blessed death can never be yours, for you die in obeying the divine Word and commandment in Romans 13."

Source: James Harvey Robinson, Readings in European History, vol. 2 (1906); C. M. Jacobs translation. See Chapter 4.

B.5 — The Schleitheim Confession, Articles VI and VII (24 February 1527)

> "[Article VI] The sword is ordained of God outside the perfection of Christ… it is not appropriate for a Christian to serve as a magistrate because… the government magistracy is according to the flesh, but the Christian's is according to the Spirit…
>
> [Article VII] Christ, who teaches the perfection of the Law, prohibits all swearing to His followers, whether true or false… we cannot fulfill that which we promise when we swear, for we cannot change even the very least thing on us."

Source: Rod and Staff Publishers reprint, 1985. See Chapter 5.

B.6 — The trial of Michael Sattler (Rottenburg, 1527)

> Charged, among other counts, with declaring "that men are not to swear before the authorities," and with holding that if the Turks invaded the country, no resistance should be offered, and that he "would rather take the field against the Christians than against the Turks." Sentenced: tongue cut out; body torn with red-hot tongs; burned to ashes.

Source: Thieleman J. van Braght, Martyrs Mirror (1660; Sohm English translation, CCEL). See Chapter 5.

B.7 — Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, Book IV, Chapter 20 (1559)

> "Fanatics, indeed, delighting in unbridled license, insist and vociferate that… it is unworthy of us, and far beneath our dignity, to be occupied with those profane and impure cares which relate to matters alien from a Christian man… [But] if we understand that the magistrate, in inflicting

> punishment, acts not of himself, but executes the very judgments of God, we shall be disencumbered of every doubt… 'He beareth not the sword in vain,' says Paul, 'for he is the minister of God' (Rom. 13:4)."

Source: Henry Beveridge English translation, via CCEL. See Chapter 5.

B.8 — The trial and sentencing of Michael Servetus (Geneva, 1553)

> Convicted of anti-Trinitarian doctrine, of denying Christ's eternal sonship, of rejecting infant baptism, and of "causing a schism of faith and church in Geneva." The verdict was submitted to, and independently confirmed by, every Swiss Reformed canton consulted, including Zurich under Heinrich Bullinger. Executed by burning, with his books, on the hill of Champel, 27 October 1553.

Source: Albert Rilliet, Calvin and Servetus (1846 English translation and annotation by W. K. Tweedie), compiled from the original Geneva council registers. See Chapter 7.

B.9 — Tyndale's reported last words (Vilvoorde, 6 October 1536)

> "Lord, open the King of England's eyes."

Source: standard historiography (Britannica; David Daniell's biography of Tyndale). See Chapter 8.

B.10 — Thomas Cranmer's final address and execution (St Mary's, Oxford, 21 March 1556)

> "And now I come to the great thing which so much troubleth my conscience… and that is the setting abroad of a writing contrary to the

truth; which now here I renounce and refuse, as things written with my hand contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart… And forasmuch as my hand offended, writing contrary to my heart, my hand shall first be punished therefor; for, may I come to the fire, it shall be first burned."

"And when the wood was kindled, and the fire began to burn near him, stretching out his arm, he put his right hand into the flame, which he held so steadfast and immovable… that all men might see his hand burned before his body was touched… and oftentimes he repeated 'his unworthy right hand'… and using often the words of Stephen, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,' in the greatness of the flame he gave up the ghost."

Source: John Foxe, Acts and Monuments (1837 Cattley/Townsend edition), vol. 8, pp. 87–90. See Chapter 8.

B.11 — The Quakers Act 1695 (royal assent 1696)

"Whereas divers Dissenters commonly called Quakers refusing to take an Oath in Courts of Justice and other Places are frequently imprisoned and their Estates sequestered… to the Ruine of themselves and Families… every Quaker… shall instead of the usual Forme be permitted to make his or her Solemne Affirmation or Declaration… [which] shall be adjudged and taken… to be of the same Force and Effect… as if such Quaker had taken an Oath in the usual Forme."

Source: UK National Archives statute text, legislation.gov.uk. See Chapter 9.

Appendix C: Limits, Contested Points, and Counter-Cases

Following this series' own Appendix H convention (Volume 3), this appendix states the formal limits of this volume's method and evidence in one place, for a reader who wants the caveats gathered rather than scattered across chapters.

C.1 — The comparison-set methodology and its own limits

Chapter 10′s nineteen-case comparison set is a compiled survey drawn from standard reference and secondary-scholarship sources (Wikipedia, Britannica, Encyclopedia.com, GAMEO, and Schaff's History of the Christian Church via CCEL), not an exhaustive census of every recorded heresy proceeding in the period. A genuinely rigorous version of this claim would require a systematic database of named heresy trials across a defined region and period, which is beyond the scope of a volume of this kind. Several individual codings in the table are judgment calls rather than unambiguous data points — how "organized" Tyndale's translation-and-smuggling network counts as, precisely where Sebastian Franck's rhetoric sits on the textual-mediation axis — and this volume presents them as such rather than as settled facts.

C.2 — The multi-variable complexity trade-off

The refined thesis in Chapters 10 and 11 depends on four variables — mechanism count, organizational status, state consolidation or elite patronage, and the challenger's own coercive capacity — rather than the single variable a first, cruder version of the argument might have proposed. This is a real cost to the thesis's rhetorical simplicity, openly acknowledged in Chapter 13. It is not, on the evidence gathered, a cost to its accuracy: the additional variables

were specified and coded from historical facts established independently of the outcomes they explain (the dated content of the Edict of Torda, the documented timing of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's wartime crisis, Wycliffe's documented relationship to John of Gaunt, the Huguenot nobility's documented prior possession of fortified towns under treaty), not inferred backward from the persecution intensity each is used to account for.

C.3 — Novelty calibration

This volume claims originality for one specific thing: the connective argument running from the interpolation thesis (Volumes 1–2) through the oath-architecture and canon-as-political-product argument (Volume 3) to the Reformation's demonstrated relocation, rather than resolution, of the same control mechanisms. It does not claim to have discovered that Reformation-era violence had structural, non-doctrinal causes. That claim, in adjacent and independently-derived forms, belongs to R. I. Moore's persecuting-society thesis, René Girard's account of the scapegoat mechanism, and the Reinhard–Schilling confessionalization literature, all of which are cited directly in Chapter 11 as convergent prior art rather than as this project's own discovery.

C.4 — The antisemitism material's bounded status

Chapter 12 is not a sixth data point for the triangulation table in Chapter 10 or Appendix E, and no argument elsewhere in this volume should be read as treating it as one. It is presented explicitly as a different analytical category — a scapegoating mechanism operating on a fixed, inherited out-group rather than on an organized structural challenge — and the historiographical debate over its long-term influence (the mainstream continuous-influence view against Johannes Wallmann's discontinuity argument) is represented as genuinely unsettled, not resolved in whichever direction would be rhetorically convenient for this volume's broader argument.

C.5 — Sources sought but not obtained

Calvin's own Defensio orthodoxae fidei de sacra Trinitate (1554) remains available only in the original Latin; no open-access English translation was located. This gap is substantially, though not fully, mitigated by Rilliet and

Tweedie's 1846 documentary account of the trial (Appendix B.8) and by Castellio's contemporary Latin rebuttal, which quotes Calvin's own language. A professional translation of either Latin text, if it becomes available, would be the single most valuable addition to any future revision of this volume. Cranmer's 1556 final execution narrative is drawn from Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. 8 (Appendix B.10; Chapter 8).

C.6 — What this volume does not argue

This volume does not argue that Luther, Calvin, or any other reformer acted in personal bad faith, or that the Reformation's theological content was a mere pretext for power politics with no independent content of its own — Chapter 13 addresses this directly. It does not argue that the Catholic Church's own persecution of dissent was less severe, less real, or less structurally motivated than the Protestant instances this volume happens to examine in detail; the Waldensian case in Chapter 10 is offered specifically to establish the opposite. And it does not argue that the reformers were hypocrites in any simple sense — Chapter 1 states plainly that Luther's opening objection to the indulgence trade was sincere and well-founded. The argument is structural, not characterological: an inherited, already-edited text supplied the same tools to every new confessional authority that inherited it, and each authority, whatever its founders' personal sincerity, used those tools the same way once a sufficiently organized challenge met a sufficiently consolidated state.

Appendix D: Selected Bibliography

D.1 — Primary sources (public domain)

- Luther, Martin. Disputation on the Power and Efficacy of Indulgences ("The Ninety-Five Theses"), 1517. CCEL English translation.
- Luther, Martin. Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed, 1523. CSS/ISN translation.
- Luther, Martin. An Admonition to Peace: A Reply to the Twelve Articles of the Swabian Peasants, 1525. C. M. Jacobs translation, Works of Martin Luther.
- Luther, Martin. Against the Murderous, Thieving Hordes of Peasants, 1525. C. M. Jacobs translation; James Harvey Robinson, Readings in European History, vol. 2 (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1906).
- Luther, Martin. On the Jews and Their Lies, 1543. English translation 1971 (per standard historiography); summarized via secondary scholarship for this volume, per the caution in Chapter 12.
- The Schleitheim Confession, 1527. Rod and Staff Publishers reprint, 1985.
- Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion, Book IV, Chapter 20, "Of Civil Government," 1559 final Latin edition. Henry Beveridge English translation, via CCEL.
- The Quakers Act 1695 (7 & 8 Will. 3. c. 34) and the Oaths Act 1978. UK National Archives, legislation.gov.uk.
- Van Braght, Thieleman J. The Bloody Theater, or Martyrs' Mirror (Dutch original, 1660); Joseph F. Sohm English translation from the 1660 Dutch edition (1st Sohm ed. 1886; Herald Press reprint), via CCEL, public domain —

including the trial and execution record of Michael Sattler and the author's own period disclaimer distancing mainstream Anabaptism from Münster.
- Foxe, John. The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe: A New and Complete Edition, ed. Stephen Reed Cattley, preliminary dissertation by George Townsend (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837–41, 8 vols.) — vol. 5 (Tyndale's life and execution), vol. 6 (Cranmer's 1554 Oxford eucharist disputations), vol. 8 (Cranmer's 1556 recantation, reversal, and execution at Oxford, pp. 84–90; title page dated 1837).
- Rilliet, Albert. Calvin and Servetus: The Reformer's Share in the Trial of Michael Servetus Historically Ascertained, trans. and annotated by W. K. Tweedie (Edinburgh & London: J. Johnstone, 1846) — built from the original Geneva trial and council-register documents.
- Castellio, Sebastian. Contra libellum Calvini (written 1554; published 1612). Latin; not yet translated. Facsimile and OCR held for reference; cited only via secondary scholarship pending translation.

D.2 — Secondary scholarship

- Blickle, Peter. The Revolution of 1525: The German Peasants' War from a New Perspective. Trans. Thomas A. Brady Jr. and H. C. Erik Midelfort. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981 (translation of Die Revolution von 1525).
- Gregory, Brad S. The Unintended Reformation: How a Religious Revolution Secularized Society. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Moore, R. I. The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987; 2nd ed., Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Moore, R. I. The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2012 (UK ed.: London: Profile Books, 2012).
- Girard, René. Violence and the Sacred. Trans. Patrick Gregory. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977 (translation of La violence et le sacré, 1972).
- Girard, René. The Scapegoat. Trans. Yvonne Freccero. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986 (translation of Le bouc émissaire, 1982).

- Girard, René. I See Satan Fall Like Lightning. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2001 (translation of Je vois Satan tomber comme l'éclair, 1999).
- Reinhard, Wolfgang. "Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State: A Reassessment." Catholic Historical Review 75, no. 3 (1989): 383–404.
- Schilling, Heinz. "Confessionalization in the Empire: Religious and Societal Change in Germany between 1555 and 1620." In Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society: Essays in German and Dutch History, 205–45. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Williams, George Huntston. The Radical Reformation. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962; 3rd ed. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2000.

D.3 — Cross-references within the series

- Volume 1, The Argument in Brief — the short-form statement of the interpolation thesis this volume assumes throughout.
- Volume 2, How Paul's Letters Were Edited — the full textual argument for Romans 13:1–7 and related passages as later additions; Chapter 32, "The Trinity: Marcion's Question, Nicaea's Answer," directly informs Chapter 7 of this volume.
- Volume 3, The Chain from Scripture to Sovereignty — Chapter 21, "The Architecture of Oaths," and the "self-refuting institution" argument of Chapter 19, both directly extended by this volume; Chapter 23, "How the Other Architecture Actually Runs," is the constructive vision this volume's closing chapter measures the Reformation against.

Appendix E: The Comparison Set, Full Table

The complete coded table underlying Chapter 10, presented here in full for readers who want to inspect or contest the coding directly.

Mechanisms

T textual mediation
D doctrinal/Trinitarian boundary-policing
O oath/membership refusal
H hierarchy/property challenge

Intensity scale

0 no adverse action
1 condemnation only (anathema, book-banning)
2 banishment/exile
3 imprisonment, property confiscation, or expulsion under threat of death
4 execution

Case	Date/Place	T	D	O	H	Organized?	Intensity	Detail
Erasmus	1500s–1536	No	No	No	No	No	0	No adverse action in life; posthumous (1559) Index listing only
Sebastian Franck	1520s–1543	Partial	No	No	No	Explicitly refused	2	Repeated banishment (Strasbourg, Ulm), anathematized by name at Schmalkalden 1540, life as a wanderer
Caspar Schwenckfeld	1520s–1561	No	Yes	No	No	No (followers organized posthumously)	2	Repeated banishment, books anathematized, decades as a fugitive; secretly buried to prevent posthumous exhumation-burning
Wycliffe personally	1370s–1384	Yes	No	No	No	No (elite-patronage protected)	1 (life) → 4 (posthumous)	Formally condemned but undisturbed in life; corpse exhumed and burned 1428
Transylvanian Unitarians (Torda)	1568	No	Yes	No	No	Yes, but state fragmented	0	Legalized — the identical Trinity-denial that killed Servetus

Polish Brethren, early phase	1565–1638	No	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes, weak/ decentralized state	1	Tolerated 70 years under the Warsaw Confederation; presses suppressed 1638
Lollards, pre-1381	1370s–1381	Yes	No	No	No	Emerging	1	Condemned, not yet a burning offense
Ferenc Dávid, phase 2	1571–1579	No	Yes (further)	No	No	Yes	3	Convicted of "innovation," imprisoned, died in prison once the state re-consolidated
Polish Brethren, expulsion	1655–1658	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	Expelled, property liquidated, death penalty for return, under wartime consolidation
Quakers	1650s–1696	No	No	Yes	No	Yes (explicitly nonviolent)	3 → resolved	Imprisonment/fines under the 1662 Act; statutory accommodation by 1696
Lollards, post-1381	1381–1414+	Yes	No	No	Yes (tainted by 1381 revolt)	Yes, once linked to Oldcastle	4	De heretico comburendo 1401; burnings; 1409 vernacular-Bible ban
Waldensians	1170s–1500s	Yes	No	Yes	Partial	Yes (rival preaching network)	4	300 years of episodic execution/Inquisition
Michael Sattler	1527	No	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes (sworn congregation)	4	Tongue cut out, tortured, burned
Servetus	1553	No	Yes	No	No	No (lone pamphleteer)	4	Burned; verdict cross-endorsed by every Swiss canton consulted
Tyndale	1530s	Yes	No	No	No	Partial (translation network)	4	Strangled then burned; translation adopted by the Crown within a year
Peasants (1525)	1525	No	No	No	Yes	Yes (armed uprising)	4	100,000 killed, explicitly justified via Romans 13
Savonarola	1494–1498	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (Piagnoni faction ran Florence's government)	4	Excommunicated 1497; joint papal–Florentine tribunal; tortured, hanged, and burned, 1498
Huguenots	1562–1598	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (armed, noble-led, fortified towns)	4 → negotiated	St Bartholomew's Day Massacre (1572), 5,000–30,000 killed; military parity with the crown forced the Edict of Nantes (1598), later revoked (1685)
Diggers	1649–1650	Partial	No	No	Yes	Yes, but unarmed, 40–50 people	2–3	Crops destroyed, houses burned by gentry-organized mobs; no execution; dispersed within a year, under Cromwell's own revolutionary government

Reading the table

Ranking every case by mechanism count and organizational status predicts its position on the 0–4 scale better than the doctrine's specific content does. Erasmus (0 mechanisms, unorganized) sits at 0. Franck and Schwenckfeld (1 mechanism, explicitly unorganized) land at a sustained 2 — never safe,

never at the ceiling. The Transylvania and Poland cases isolate state consolidation as an independent variable: the identical doctrine draws a 0 under a fragmented state and a 3 under a consolidated one, in the same place, a decade apart. Wycliffe and the Lollards isolate elite patronage the same way: a 1 in life under protection, a 4 within two generations once the protection and the doctrine's later reputational taint (the Peasants' Revolt association) combine. Cases combining an organized, institutionally-competing challenge with the oath or hierarchy mechanism, under a consolidated state, sit at the ceiling: Sattler, Servetus, Tyndale, the peasants, Savonarola — thirty-one years before Luther, under an entirely intra-Catholic tribunal — and, three and a half centuries before any of them, under a purely Catholic hierarchy with no Protestant rival at all, the Waldensians. The Huguenots and the Diggers each isolate one further variable at the edges of the table: the Huguenots show that a challenger with real military parity can force the ceiling response into a negotiated equilibrium rather than extinction; the Diggers show that the same hierarchy-dissolving inference the German peasants drew, pursued in an organized but explicitly unarmed and small-scale way, caps the response well below the ceiling even under a government born from the reforming side's own revolution.